DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 776

EC 003 380

By-Schmitt, Philip J.; And Others
Supervisors and Supervision of Teachers of the Deaf.
Illinois Univ., Urbana. Inst. of Research for Exceptional Children.
Spons Agency-Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 68
Grant-RD-12995
Note-192p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$9.70
Descriptors-*Administration, Administrator Evaluation, Administrator Qualifications, Administrator Responsibility, Administrator Role, *Aurally Handicapped, Day Programs, Deaf, *Exceptional Child Research, Graduate Study, Professional Education, Residential Programs, Salaries, School Administration, Standards, *Supervisors, Supervisory Activities, Teacher Experience, Teacher Supervision

Data from 258 supervisors of teachers of the deaf who replied to a self administered questionnaire yielded information on the nature of supervisory programs. Of 108 day supervisors (D), 23% were supervisors only while 77% were also either teachers or administrators. One-third reported three-fourths to full time devoted to supervision; one-third reported one-fourth time or less. Day supervisors were responsible for wider age ranges of children and types of teachers supervised and tended to receive better salaries. Of 150 residential supervisors (R), one-third were supervisors only, 93% worked with teachers of the deaf only, and two-thirds reported three-fourths to full time supervision. Both groups spent similar amounts of time per month with teachers; the majority had master's degrees (D-group 82%, R-group 67%); and degrees in deaf education, audiology, or speech correction were held by one-half of the D-group and one-third of the R-group. Results indicate a need for more supervisors, improvement in the quality of supervision, setting of standards for supervisory personnel, and professional consideration of these problems. (JB)

DEC 2 6 1968

Supervisors and Supervision of Teachers of the Deaf

PHILIP J. SCHMITT
STEPHEN P. QUIGLEY
JILL QUADAGNO

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH
ON EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
210 Education
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS · URBANA
61801

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SUPERVISORS AND SUPERVISION
OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

Philip J. Schmitt, M.A.
Stephen P. Quigley, Ph.D.
Jill Quadagno, M.A.

Institute for Research on Exceptional Children
University of Illinois

This investigation was supported, in part, by a research grant RD 12995 from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter | Page

Acknowledgments ii

List of Tables iii

I. Introduction and Objectives. 1

II. Summary, Discussion, and Implications. 5
  A. - F. Chapter Summaries 7
  G. Implications 24

III. Procedures and Background Information 29
  A. Procedures and Background Information 29
  B. Categorization of the Data 35
  C. Program and Supervisor Representation in the Study 38

IV. Supervision Patterns In Programs for the Deaf 43
  A. Reported Numbers of Supervisory Personnel 43
  B. Supervision Patterns: Supervisor-Types and Supervision-Times 45
  C. Extent of Supervision: Total Supervision-Time Within Single Programs 54

V. The Nature of Supervisory Positions. 61
  A. Control Variables: Supervisor-types 61
  B. Characteristic of Supervisory Positions 64
  C. Professional Activities Related to Supervisory Positions 83

VI. Classroom Visits: Practice and Procedures 95
  A. Time Amounts and Scheduling of Visits 95
  B. Supervisory Visit Activities 109

VII. Personal Characteristics and Educational and Professional Backgrounds of the Respondents 119
  A. Personal Characteristics 119
  B. Academic Background 121
  C. Professional Experience 128
  D. Professional Activities and Affiliations 135

VIII. Graduate Programs For Supervisors 145
  A. Supervisor Preparation Programs for Experienced Teachers 145
  B. Advanced Study Programs for Supervisors 155

References. 163

Appendix A 165

Appendix B 177

Appendix C 181

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to the United States Vocational Rehabilitation Administration for its support of this project.

They wish to express appreciation to Dr. William Jenne and Mrs. Sondra Phillips for their assistance in preparing the questionnaire and devising methods of data analysis; to the many professional persons in education of the deaf who contributed support and advice; to the persons who assisted in coding and tabulating the data; and to Mrs. June Chambliss, who devoted considerable time and effort to preparing the very rough drafts, the rough drafts, and the final version of this report.

The authors also wish to express their gratitude to the administrators of programs for the deaf for their assistance in locating supervisors. And most of all, the authors offer a very special vote of thanks to each supervisor who unselfishly devoted an hour or two of his time to completing the lengthy questionnaire. The authors sincerely hope the results of the study will justify the efforts of all these individuals.

Philip J. Schmitt
University of Illinois

LIST OF TABLES

Page

III. PROCEDURES AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Response rate for administrators of programs with four or more teachers of the deaf 32
2. Number of individuals and programs represented in questionnaire mailings 33
3. Returned, unreturned, and unusable responses 34
4. Representation in the study of programs of various size-categories 39
5. Supervisor representation in the study 41

IV. SUPERVISION PATTERNS IN PROGRAMS FOR THE DEAF

6. Numbers of supervisors reported by administrators for programs of various sizes 44
7. Supervisor-types in Day and Residential programs of various sizes 47
8. Supervision-times for supervisors in Day and Residential programs of various sizes 49
9a. Day programs and supervisors: distribution of supervisor-respondents according to program-size category, supervisor-type, and time devoted to supervision 51
9b. Residential programs and supervisors: distribution of supervisor-respondents according to program-size category, supervisor-type, and time devoted to supervision 52
10. Representation in the study of various program types and sizes 56
11. Amounts of supervision in fully-represented and nearly-represented programs 58

V. THE NATURE OF SUPERVISORY POSITIONS

12. Comparison of program time-values to criterion time-values representing a teacher-(full-time)-supervisor ratio of approximately 12:1 60
13. Distribution of supervisor -types in Day and Residential programs 61
14. Number of academic teachers of the deaf supervised by individual supervisors 65
15. Approximate number of hours per month devoted to supervisory activities related to education of the deaf 66
16. Supervision-time ratios: number of hours per month spent for each teacher by Day and Residential supervisors of various types 68
17. Respondents supervising at various age levels 70
18. Types of teachers supervised 71
19. Administrative positions held by respondents who reported holding administrative posts in addition to supervisory positions (Supervisor-types SA and SAT) 73
20. Types of children for whom SA and SAT respondents are responsible 75
21. Time devoted to teaching deaf children by Supervisor-teachers (ST) and Supervisor-administrator-teachers (SAT) 77

LIST OF TABLES CON'T.

Page

22. Administrative persons to whom respondents are directly responsible as supervisors of teachers of the deaf 78
23. Time basis of position as supervisor 80
24. 1965-1966 gross salary 81
25. Comparison of supervisor and teacher salaries 83
26. Substitute teaching and tutorial teaching done regularly by supervisor respondents 84
27. Hours per month devoted to advisory meetings and to consultations with individual teachers of the deaf 86
28. Number of supervisory meetings held with groups of teachers during the course of a year 87
29. Professional school activities which the respondents participated in (P) and directed (D) during the 1964-65 school year 90
30. Responses to the question: "Do student teachers spend time working in your educational system for the deaf?" 92
31. Responsibilities for student teachers reported by respondents 93

VI. CLASSROOM VISITS: PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES

32. Approximate number of hours per month devoted to supervisory visits in classes for the deaf 96
33. Visit-time ratios: number of hours per month spent visiting each teacher by Day and Residential supervisors 99
34. Approximate number of visits paid to an average teacher during the course of a year 101
35. Estimated lengths of "shorter" supervisory classroom visits 103
36. Estimated lengths of "longer" supervisory classroom visits 105
37. Estimated lengths of "average" supervisory classroom visits 106
38. Approximate percentage of visits which are "surprise visits" (teacher not informed of supervisor's coming ahead of time) 108
39. Notification-time given teacher for scheduled visits 109
40. Topics discussed with teachers during supervisory visits 110
41. Combinations of visiting activity categories checked by respondents 112
42. Responses indicating how frequently supervisors demonstrate techniques by working with the children themselves 114
43. Responses indicating the usefulness of offering comments and discussing teaching techniques with the teacher while the class is in session 115
44. Percentage of classroom visits which include or are followed by conferences concerning the visits 117

VII. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE RESPONDENTS

45. Sex of respondents 119
46. Ages of respondents 120
47. Highest earned academic degrees 121
48. Numbers and types of degrees earned and being earned 123

LIST OF TABLES CON'T.

Page

49. Major areas of academic work at various levels 124
50. Number of courses (credit and non-credit) taken outside of degree work during the past ten years 127
51. Total number of years experience as a teacher of the deaf 129
52. Types of teaching experience with the deaf 130
53. Ages of deaf children taught 131
54. Experience teaching non-deaf handicapped children and non-handicapped children 132
55. Total number of years engaged in supervisory work in programs for the deaf 133
56. Total number of years experience supervising and/or teaching in programs for the deaf 134
57. Number of articles published in professional journals 136
58. Attendance at professional conventions and meetings for the years 1960-1966 137
59. Participation in professional activities during the period September, 1964, through August, 1965 139
60. Number of national organizations of which supervisors are members 140
61. Number of regional, state, and local organizations (related to the education of the deaf, general education, and related areas) of which supervisors are members 141
62. National organizations of which supervisors are members 142
63. Professional certification 143

VIII. GRADUATE PROGRAMS FOR SUPERVISORS

64. Minimum years of classroom experience considered necessary by respondents for an individual to become a supervisor of teachers of the deaf 146
65. Rating scores and rankings for various types of supervisor preparation programs 149
66. Supervisors' opinions on whether a non-doctoral supervisor training program should lead to some sort of special certification 150
67. Courses for supervisor preparation programs: groupings by major areas and rankings of courses for various groups 152
68. Rating scores and rankings of graduate courses in supervisor preparation programs 153
69. Rating scores and rankings of various experiences for supervisor preparation programs 155
70. Courses for advanced study by supervisors: groupings by major areas and rankings of courses for various groups 157
71. Supervisors' rating scores and rankings of graduate courses for their own advanced study 158
72. Rating scores and rankings of various experiences for advanced study programs for supervisors 160

APPENDIX B

B1. Supervisors in individual programs for the deaf 178

LIST OF TABLES CON'T.

Page

APPENDIX C

C1. Supervisors' ratings of various types of graduate programs for preparing supervisors 182
C2. Day supervisors' ratings of graduate courses for experienced teachers of the deaf preparing to become supervisors 183
C3. Residential supervisors' ratings of graduate courses for experienced teachers of the deaf preparing to become supervisors 184
C4. Supervisors' ratings of various experiences for teachers of the deaf preparing to become supervisors 185
C5. Day supervisors' ratings of graduate courses for their own advanced study 186
C6. Residential supervisors' ratings of graduate courses for their own advanced study 187
C7. Supervisors' ratings of various experiences for their own advanced study 188

I. INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

Supervisors of classroom instruction are key members of the education team in any type of school system. Combining many skills of teachers and administrators with special skills of their own, they are able to play a unique role in directing and guiding instruction, in influencing administrators, teachers, and pupils, and in making unique contributions to the maintainance of quality and the improvement of the entire educational program.

Programs for deaf children would appear to have particular needs for supervisors. Because of the rather specialized and complex nature of instruction for deaf children; because of the compounding effects of hearing loss and additional handicaps on already existing inter- and intra- individual differences of children; because of the need for close articulation and coordination of all aspects of the educational program -- for these and other reasons, the services of skilled, knowledgeable persons are required to maintain close contact with teachers and children in the classroom while also maintaining contact with administrators and ancillary personnel.

Whether responsible for supervision on a full or part time basis, whether responsible for five classrooms or fifteen, the supervisor of teachers of the deaf has certain basic obligations to fulfill.* At a minimal level these obligations would include periodic observation of classroom activities and conferences with teachers for purposes of: a) keeping abreast of class and individual pupil progress, curriculum areas being covered, and instructional techniques being used; b) evaluating the quality and appropriateness of instructional procedures and providing feedback to teachers; c) offering ideas for improving the quality of instruction; d) helping teachers to function successfully in areas such as home-school contacts, classroom administration, and professional matters; and e) making certain that pupils are being helped to realize their full potential. In this unique position as an over-seer of classes, the supervisor also has opportunities for f) coordinating the educational program in terms of curriculum, instruction, and disposition of pupils and g) serving as a channel of communication between teachers and between teachers and administrators.

---

*Supervisors of academic teachers of the deaf are the target population for this study. To avoid confusion with supervisory personnel in non-academic or extracurricular areas and to avoid exclusion or inclusion of persons on the basis of job titles alone, a functional definition was adopted. Thus, the term "supervisor", in this study, refers to "all individuals, with or without the title 'supervisor', whose responsibilities include, either fully or in part, supervision of academic teachers of the deaf". This definition includes most "supervising teachers", "grade-level supervisors", "supervisors of programs for the hearing impaired", and so forth. On the basis of their job responsibilities it also includes many persons with designations such as "head teacher", "principal", "director of special education", and the like.

In addition to these basic functions, the supervisor may provide many other services, the nature of these depending upon the type and size of system, his assigned functions and those of other staff members, and the amount of time and effort he is able to devote to the position. He may, for example, assume responsibility for such things as: in-service programs for teachers; committees and meetings of various kinds; parent contact, education, and counseling; work with student teachers; integration of the children into regular classes; tutoring; substitute teaching; curriculum study; materials and media; and diagnosis, staffing, and referral of children in the program.

From these lists of basic and supplementary job responsibilities one might postulate a set of qualifications needed by a supervisor in order to function successfully. At a basic level, the person must be well able to relate to others and to work and communicate with others. Certainly the person should be knowledgable concerning education of the deaf, including all aspects of instruction and provisions for various types of children. He should be well informed concerning the background of the field, subsidiary fields, and current trends and developments. And many would agree that the supervisor should himself be a "master teacher" of the deaf, although opinions might differ on the breadth, amount, and type of teaching experience necessary.

In addition to the supervisor himself, there are administrative considerations which determine the success of supervision within a program. Perhaps most important, there must be sufficient time allotted specifically for supervisory activities. Even though the supervisor may have administrative and/or teaching responsibilities (and may, in fact, be primarily an administrator or teacher), he must not be so burdened with these responsibilities that he has insufficient time for classroom visits and other supervisory functions. He must not become a supervisor in name only. In addition, the supervisor should be assured of the support of higher-administrative persons in matters under his supervisory jurisdiction, and he should be given sufficient freedom to explore new ways of improving the quality of educational programs.

In the last decade, individuals and groups have voiced increasing concern over many aspects of the education of deaf children in the United States. In response to these appeals, numerous improvements have been undertaken in areas such as teacher education and re-education, materials and media, curriculum, and provisions for very young children and for deaf youth. In addition, a wide variety of research projects have provided new insights into the characteristics and needs of deaf children, and new alliances are being forged with other fields and professions which have contributions to make to education of the deaf.

The ultimate goal of most of these endeavors is the improvement of education and services for deaf children. Yet, if one accepts the preceding description of the key role of classroom supervisors in educational programs for the deaf, then it would appear that the field as a whole has tended to overlook one of the vital components of the educational system in terms of research, professional discussion, and publications. A review of the literature supports this conclusion. There are a few articles which discuss the general problems and responsibilities of supervisors (Killorin, 1949; Snider, 1949; Bryan, 1951; McMillan, 1951; Patton, 1955; Braught, 1967). Groht (1939) discussed the qualifications for supervising teachers and their duties in detail, and Hoffmeier (1951) related supervisory work in regular education to the area of the deaf, with many suggestions for specific techniques to be followed in supervising classroom teachers. Other authors focused on specific topics, such as supervision of new teachers (Casey, 1947; Schunhoff, 1947; Shinpaugh, 1949) and the supervisor's role in particular curriculum areas (Hamel, 1957; Groht, 1955). Mayers (1951) discussed supervision in Northwest states. Schunhoff (1964), in a major survey, provided a tabulation of different types of supervisory personnel in public residential schools of various sizes. Beyond these articles, there are only scattered references to supervision in other sources and a number of brief reports of panels on supervision, most of which are inspirational or narrative in nature.

While many of the cited articles contain information of value, the overall impression is that (a) little attention has been paid to the qualifications and characteristics of supervisors and their roles and responsibilities in educational programs; (b) little discussion has taken place concerning procedures and problems of supervision in classes for the deaf; (c) there have been no large-scale evaluative studies of supervision within programs for the deaf in the United States; and (d) little effort has been made to apply work done in the field of supervision in regular education to the area of the deaf.

The primary goal of this study is to stimulate discussion and action concerning supervision and supervisors in programs for the deaf. In the belief that discussion and action must proceed on a foundation of facts, the project attempts to provide at least a portion of that foundation in the form of information on supervision and supervisors. More specifically, the objectives of the study have been:

a) to locate supervisors of programs for the deaf (with 4 or more teachers) in the United States;
b) to describe the roles of these supervisors and the nature of their positions and supervisory activities;
c) to describe the professional characteristics and backgrounds of the supervisors; and
d) to obtain the ideas of current supervisors on possible graduate programs for supervisors.

Although the initial focus of the study was on supervisors and questionnaire items were designed to elicit information on these individuals, it became apparent that much of the data received also provided information on supervision in programs for the deaf. Thus, an additional objective became:

e) to describe, as completely as possible from the available data, the current extent and nature of supervision in programs for the deaf.

II. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter contains summaries of the study procedures and of findings in five major areas: patterns of supervision in programs for the deaf (Chapter IV); the nature of supervisory positions (V); classroom visits: practices and procedures (VI); personal characteristics and educational and professional backgrounds of the respondents (VII); and graduate programs for supervisors (VIII). While succeeding chapters present full descriptions and data in these areas and discuss both major and minor patterns revealed in the data, this summary focuses on the more significant findings of the study and attempts to point out trends and patterns that underlie many of the findings. The reader is advised to complete this overview chapter before proceeding to chapters and sections of special interest to him.

A few points should be made first concerning the study as a whole. These are discussed below.

1. The reader should be aware of two representational limitations of the study -- one "built-in", the other unavoidable. The first refers to the fact that the project was restricted to programs with four or more teachers of the deaf (explained in Chapter III). While this affects the representation of Residential supervisors and programs little if at all, it does curtail the representation of Day supervisors -- the extent of curtailment depending upon how many Day programs with one to three teachers in fact have supervisors of teachers of the deaf. (This would in itself be an interesting focus of investigation, particularly since a substantial number of the Day programs in the United States have fewer than four teachers of the deaf according to listings in the *American Annals of the Deaf*).

The second, "unavoidable" limitation is one imposed by the nature of questionnaire studies in general. The reader is merely reminded that while 71% of the programs for the deaf in the United States (with four or more teachers) and 65% of the supervisors are represented in this study, there are large proportions of programs and supervisors that are not. Thus, while this report discusses "supervisors of the deaf" in general and often appears to equate "respondents" with "supervisors", it is advisable to keep a "sampling orientation" in mind while interpreting data and findings.

2. Simple frequency distributions of the questionnaire responses of all 258 respondents would have obscured important underlying patterns which were present in the data, and so a variety of categories (control variables) were considered for use in presenting data in the most meaningful way. One category eventually selected was based on distinctions between three supervisor-types (explained later). A second categorization -- probably the major one -- turned out to be based on type of program, for no matter how the data were viewed, the most significant differences that occurred were those between Day and Residential supervisors and programs, probably due to a number of characteristics inherent in each type of program. This is not to imply that the two types of supervisors and supervisors are fundamentally different, for their similarities far outweigh their differences. However, both Day and Residential responses reveal characteristic positive as well as negative factors related to supervision, and the prime use of this categorization is to discover these characteristic patterns and trends within the areas under study. This dichotomy is purely functional and, hopefully, objective.

3. Despite careful preparation and editing of the questionnaire and despite its submission to detailed scrutiny by others, the homily "hindsight is better than foresight" seems bound to plague anyone undertaking a study such as this. Certain items are misinterpreted by respondents, whereas slight changes of wording might have clarified them; the data reveal interesting patterns in areas which were covered only cursorily in the questionnaire; the method of coding data prevents certain analyses unless extensive re-coding is undertaken; and finally, sheer limitation of space restricts the inclusion of much information that is of limited interest yet relevant to the study. Even the orientation of a study may shift slightly as the data are analyzed, causing the investigator to wish that items had been altered or added. (For example, the initial emphasis of this study on _supervisors_ was later augmented by a concern for the nature and extent of _supervision_ -- a fact which, if anticipated, would have altered some items of the questionnaire). All these have occurred to some extent in this project, and the reader is requested to keep these in mind while going through the following material. (Cynics might even say that the rubber-stamp "further investigation is indicated" is an inherent part of most projects of this type.)

A. PROCEDURES AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In order to locate supervisors, letters were sent to administrators of all programs with four or more teachers of the deaf requesting the names and addresses of personnel who fitted the job description "supervisor of teachers of the deaf" (as defined in the next chapter). Of the 205 (127 Day, 78 Residential) administrators contacted, 191 (93%) replied to the letter.

Ten-page self-administered questionnaires were mailed to the 398 (D 170, R 228) individuals named by administrators. Of the 332 (83%) responses received, 258 were usable questionnaires. These represented 64% of the Day supervisors and 66% of the Residential supervisors contacted, for a total usable response rate of 65%. The data were coded and submitted to computer analysis for frequency distributions.

Of the 258 respondents represented in the study, 108 (42%) are Day supervisors and 150 (58%) are Residential. In order to further differentiate "types" of supervisors, respondents were subdivided into three categories: S (Supervisors-only; persons whose primary responsibility is supervision of teachers of the deaf and, in some cases, other types of teachers); SA (Supervisor-administrators; persons who supervise and also hold administrative positions); and S(A)T (Supervisor-teachers; persons who supervise and also teach deaf children, either full or part time; some also hold administrative positions). The sample consisted of 137 SA's (D 60, R 77), 73 S's (D 25, R 48), and 48 S(A)T's (D 23, R 25).

B. SUPERVISORY PATTERNS IN PROGRAMS FOR THE DEAF

Chapter IV attempts to define the extent and nature of supervision and to discover patterns of supervision (in terms of supervisor-types and supervision -time) in programs of various types and sizes. Day programs and Residential programs are considered separately because of the great differences in size (e.g., of the total 127 Day programs contacted, almost two-thirds have fewer than ten teachers; of the 78 Residential programs, nearly two-thirds have thirty or more teachers).

1. Number of supervisors. According to administrator reports, 10% of the 127 contacted Day programs have no supervisory person, 56% have one supervisor, 13% have two, and 13% have three or more. There is a fairly direct relationship between program size and number of supervisors (e.g., small programs are most likely to report 0 to 2 supervisors, larger

programs to report 1 to 3). Noteworthy exceptions to this trend are the 11 Day programs with 20 - 29 teachers of which 8 reported only one supervisor and one reported none. Among the 78 contacted Residential programs there is again a direct relationship between program size and number of supervisors, ranging from the small program average of 1 to 2 supervisors to the large program average of 5 to 6. Exceptions to this pattern are the 14 programs with 20 - 29 teachers, 7 of which reported a single supervisor and one of which reported none.

2. Supervisor-types. Of the 108 Day supervisor-respondents, 56% are Supervisor-administrators, 23% are Supervisors-only, and 21% are Supervisor-teachers. Almost half (47%) of the Day respondents also supervise other types of teachers. Certain patterns are evident in programs of various sizes. Supervisor-administrators (SA) predominate in all size-categories except one (20 - 20 teachers). However, the relative proportions of Supervisor-teachers (S(A)T) and Supervisors-only (S) appear somewhat related to program size, since S(A)T's are typically found in small programs (4 - 9 teachers), while S's predominate in programs with 10 - 19 teachers. In programs with 20 - 29 teachers, the majority of respondents are Supervisors-only, while in programs with 30 or more teachers, most are SA's. Almost all respondents in programs with 20 or more teachers work exclusively with teachers of the deaf.

Of the 150 Residential respondents, 51% are Supervisor-administrators, 32% are Supervisors-only, and 16% are Supervisor-teachers. Almost all (93%) work only with teachers of the deaf. In relating supervisor-types to program sizes, there is a tendency for programs with fewer than 50 teachers to employ large numbers of Supervisor-administrators and Supervisor-teachers but relatively few Supervisors-only. For larger programs, the proportion of Supervisor-administrators remains fairly constant, but the proportion of Supervisor-teachers decreases sharply and there are large numbers of Supervisors-only.

3. Supervision-times. This section focuses on the individual supervisors' reported time amounts devoted to "all supervisory activities related to the program for the deaf" -- including, but not consisting solely of, time spent in classroom visits. (The distinction between "supervision-time" and "visit-time" is an important one, since often there are large discrepancies between the two). Of the Day respondents, around one-third reported 3/4 - full time devoted to all supervisory activities (120 or more hours per month),

one-sixth each reported 1/2 - 3/4 time (80 - 119 hrs./mo.) and 1/4 - 1/2 time (40 - 79 hrs./mo.), and another third reported 1/4 time or less (fewer than 40 hrs./mo.). In general, the proportions of 3/4 - full time and 1/4 - 1/2 time supervisors tend to increase with program size, with a reverse trend for 1/4 or less time supervisors. The 1/2 - 3/4 time category shows no consistent trends. Of the Residential supervisors, nearly two-thirds reported devoting 3/4 - full time to supervisory activities, and the proportion ranged from 50 - 64% of the supervisors in smaller program categories to 75 - 83% in programs with 50 - 79 teachers to around 60% in the very large programs. There are no clear-cut supervision-time/program size relationships for the 1/2 - 3/4 and 1/4 - 1/2 time supervisors. Only 6% of the total Residential respondents reported 1/4 time or less, most of these in small programs.

4. Amount of supervision. The "amount" of supervision in terms of total time devoted to supervision, was obtained for each program by adding the time amounts reported by all of its supervisor-respondents. Because of the many multiple-supervisor programs with less-than-complete representation in the study (i.e., all of the supervisors in the program did not return questionnaires), programs were designated "fully represented", "nearly-represented", "insufficiently-represented", and "unrepresented", according to specific criteria. "Supervision-time values" (combinations of all respondents' supervision-times within an individual system) were calculated using values of 1.00 for each 3/4 - full time person, .75 for 1/2 - 3/4 time, .50 for 1/4 - 1/2 time, and .25 for 1/4 time or less. Needless to say, these decimal values tend toward overestimation of actual times involved. However, they enable one to quantify very roughly the "amount of supervisory activity" taking place in individual programs and groups of programs. A program with a value of 1.50, for example, would have the equivalent of one 3/4 - full time and one 1/4 - 1/2 time supervisor, regardless of the actual number of supervisory persons in the system.

Of the 75 fully- and nearly-represented Day programs, over half (56%) have supervision time values of less than 1.00 -- related, no doubt, to the small size of many Day programs. In programs with 4 - 9 teachers, 69% have values of less than 1.00 and 31% have values of 1.00 or more. In programs with 10 - 19 teachers, these percentages are, respectively, 19% and 81%, and for programs with 20 or more teachers they are 55% and 45%. Of the 47 Residential programs so represented, only 17% have values of less than 1.00, 34%

have values of 1.00 to 1.75, and the remainder have values ranging from 2.0 to 6.00. The majority of programs with 4 to 19 teachers have values from 1.00 to 1.75. For programs with 20 to 39 teachers, half have time values of 1.50 to 1.75 and one-third have values of 2.00 or more. Of the programs with 40 to 59 teachers, half have time values of 2.75 or more, with one-sixth having 4.00 or more. The majority of programs with 60 or more teachers have values of 4.50 or more.

5. Discussion. There are some obvious conclusions to be drawn from the preceding summary. It is apparent, for example, that supervisors of teachers of the deaf are a heterogeneous group. Some are primarily responsible for supervision of teachers of the deaf and devote most of their time to this, but the majority have other responsibilities and devote varying portions of their time to supervisory work with the deaf. One might also note basic similarities between total Day and total Residential programs, such as their similar proportions of Supervisor-administrators, Supervisors-only, and Supervisor-teachers, as well as basic differences, such as the large number of Day respondents who also supervise other types of teachers and the large proportion of Residential respondents who devote 3/4 - full time to supervision. Also evident are certain supervision patterns that appear related to program size, such as the obvious relationship between program size and number of supervisors; the fact that Supervisor-administrators account for roughly half of the supervisory personnel in Day and Residential programs of all sizes, with Supervisor-teachers found primarily in smaller programs and Supervisors-only predominantly in medium-size and larger programs; and the tendency for 3/4 - full time persons to predominate in larger programs.

Perhaps the primary question raised by the data concerns the "amount" of supervision currently going on in programs for the deaf. To the writer's knowledge, there have been established no definitive, nationally-recognized guidelines on optimal teacher-(full-time)supervisor ratios. Subtopic committees involved in drafting proposals for the education of the deaf and severely hard of hearing in California* recommend a ratio not to exceed 12:1 for primary, elementary, and secondary classes. In Chapter IV this ratio is interpreted, in terms of total time devoted to supervision within a program, as "one full-time supervisor or the equivalent of one full-time supervisor (e.g., two half time supervisors) per 12 teachers". Programs for which adequate data were obtained were then measured against criteria roughly based on this 12.1 ratio. As based upon respondents' reports of supervision time, it was found that of the 127 Day programs with 4 or more teachers of the deaf, about one-third were "adequately-supervised" and another third were "inadequately-supervised". (The remaining one-third were insufficiently represented by supervisor responses to be judged.) Of the 78 Residential programs, 12% were "adequately-supervised" and 22% were "inadequately-supervised". (Unfortunately, 66% were insufficiently represented.) These figures are disturbing indeed, and they are even more so when one considers: a) that the figures used in computing time values actually tended toward over-estimation of supervision time; b) that "supervision time", as used in this analysis, was very liberally interpreted as "time devoted to all supervisory activities -- including but not consisting entirely of, classroom visits" and that many supervisors, as shown later, devoted very small portions of their time to actual visits to teachers; c) that if sufficient data had been obtained for all programs, many of the programs now classified as insufficiently represented would undoubtedly be classified as "inadequately-supervised", inflating these figures still more; and d) that the ratio of 12 teachers to 1 full-time supervisor may be considered minimal -- ratios of 10:1 or 9:1 probably being closer to optimal conditions. If a supervisor is required to devote substantial amounts of time to teaching or to administrative functions and is in fact a half-time or quarter-time supervisor, the teacher-supervisor ratio should probably be closer to 8 teachers to 1 (part-time) supervisor or even 5:1.

---

*A Proposed Plan for the Improvement of the Education of the Deaf and Severely Hard of Hearing in California. Second Draft of the Combined North and South Subtopic Committee Reports. California State Department of Education, 1967.

C. THE NATURE OF SUPERVISORY POSITIONS

Chapter V focuses on description of supervisory positions themselves, using as control variables total Day and total Residential groups and the Supervisor-type subgroups S, SA, and S(A)T. As a prelude to the discussion, profiles of the six subgroups are presented in terms of a) sizes of programs in which they are employed, b) proportions of time devoted to supervisory activities, c) types of teachers supervised, and d) existence of other supervisors in the programs. With this background, findings in 14 areas are discussed, among them the following.

1. Supervision time ratios. These ratios were computed for each supervisor-respondent by dividing his reported time (hours per month) devoted to all supervisory activities by the number of teachers for whom he is responsible. The resulting figures range from 0.1 to over 14.0. Despite great differences between Day and Residential groups in supervisory loads and gross time devoted to supervision, the two groups are remarkably similar in "hours per month per teacher devoted to supervision", the percentages of both groups being about 30% for ratios of 12.0 or more, 15% for 8.0 to 11.9, and 25% for 4.0 to 7.9. The only major difference occurred for ratios of 0.1 to 3.9 (D 26%, R 14%). In general, S's and S(A)T's have higher ratios than SA's, particularly in the Day group. This fact may be related to Supervisor-administrators' more "generalized" supervisory responsibilities for large numbers of teachers, especially in large programs.

2. Ages of children in classes supervised. The percentages of Day supervisors responsible for classes of children 0 - 3 and 4 - 5 years old are 62% and 86%, respectively, while the Residential percentages are 21% and 44%. For 15 - 17 years old and 18 or older the Day percentages are 57% and 36%, the Residential percentages 64% and 36%. In general, Day supervisors are responsible for wider age-ranges than are Residential supervisors.

3. Types of teachers supervised. Of the total Day group, 54% work exclusively with teachers of the deaf, 32% also work with teachers of the non-deaf handicapped, and 14% work with teachers of deaf and non-handicapped children or with all three types of children. Almost all Residential supervisors work exclusively with teachers of the deaf.

4. Administrative positions held. Approximately two-thirds of the Day and Residential respondents hold administrative positions in addition to their supervisory posts (types SA and SAT). About half of both groups indicated that they were principals. Far smaller percentages (generally 5 to 10%) reported positions as vice-principals, head teachers, and assistant superintendents, with others listing a wide variety of administrative posts. The major difference between groups occurred in the category "director or coordinator of special education" (D 24%, R 1%).

5. Teaching done by supervisors. Approximately 21% of the Day respondents and 15% of the Residential respondents reported classroom teaching

as part of their jobs. About one-third of both groups indicated full-time teaching, while the percentages for other times were: 3/4 time (D 13%, R 8%), 1/2 time (D 26%, R 4%), and 1/4 time or less (D 30%, R 52%). In addition, all respondents were asked whether they did tutorial teaching and substitute teaching with deaf children. Percentages responding to tutorial teaching were 19% Day, 20% Residential, to substitute teaching 19% Day, 30% Residential.

6. Time basis of position. For both Day and Residential groups, 45% of the supervisors are employed on a 10-month basis, approximately 30% on a 12-month basis, and roughly 10% each on 9- and 11-month bases. These percentages are somewhat influenced by the large subgroups of Supervisor-administrators, who tend more than the other subgroups to be employed on a 12-month basis (Day SA 47%, Residential SA 44%).

7. Salary. There are substantial differences between Day and Residential groups in reported gross salaries. Percentages for salary categories are as follows: $4999 or less, Day 3%, Residential 3%; $5000 - 8999, D 21%, R 49%; $9000 - 12,999, D 45%, R 41%; $13,000 or more, D 27%, R 3%. Within both groups the Supervisor-administrators tend to have higher salaries than the other two subgroups.

8. Meetings with teachers. As part of their supervisory activities, respondents evidently spend a good deal of time in meetings with teachers. For individual consultations with teachers, the percentages for various time amounts are: 20 hours or more per month, Day 11%, Residential 16%; 10 - 19 hours per month, D 13%, R 23%; and less than 10 hours per month, D 59%, R 33%. When asked the number of meetings held with groups of teachers over the course of a year, the responses were: 30 or more, D 13%, R 14%; 20 - 29, D 7%, R 12%; 10 - 19, D 31%, R 27%; and 1 - 9, D 35%, R 28%. The most commonly-given purposes for these meetings were related to curriculum work, in-service activities, administrative concerns, pupils and classes, "program" concerns, and techniques, methods, and materials.

9. Participation in professional school activities. In indicating the types of school activities in which they participated, the majority of the Day supervisors listed "parent-teacher organization" (80%), "in-service programs" (69%), "selection of texts and materials" (67%), "parent education and counseling" (65%), and "curriculum committee" (57%). The majority of the Residential respondents chose "selection of texts and materials" (81%), "parent-teacher organization" (74%), "curriculum committee" (67%), and "in-service programs" (59%).

10. Responsibilities for student teachers. Sixty percent of the Day and 71% of the Residential respondents reported that student teachers spent some time in their systems. Most of the respondents reported some responsibility for placement, supervision, and consultation with these students.

11. Discussion. Although Day and Residential supervisors come from two quite different types of programs in terms of size, physical facilities, and administrative structure, it is interesting to note the many similarities between the two groups. These occur in areas as diverse as proportions of Supervisor-types (S, SA, S(A)T) constituting the total groups; proportions reporting tutorial and substitute teaching; proportions reporting various administrative positions; and time bases of positions. In addition, despite large differences in supervisory loads and actual time devoted to supervision, the two groups exhibit remarkably similar amounts of time spent per month per teacher. Those differences which do occur between the groups can generally be explained by considering basic differences in the nature of Day and Residential programs. Thus, the fact that most Day programs for the deaf are part of larger school systems with many types of classes may account for the large percentage of supervisors who work in other areas besides the deaf and for the many Day Supervisor-administrators who are "directors or coordinators of special education". The typically early entrance ages for children in Day programs and the relatively small sizes of these programs are reflected in the finding that Day supervisors are generally responsible for an extremely wide range of ages. In Residential programs, with typically later entrance ages and larger numbers of children and supervisory personnel, fewer supervisors work with extremely young children, and individual supervisors are responsible for narrower age ranges.

One difference between the two groups is more difficult to explain -- namely, the differences in salaries between Day and Residential groups and subgroups. The larger salaries of the Day supervisors are even more striking since time time bases of positions for the two groups are highly similar and since the Residential supervisors as a whole tend to be older and to have more experience than the Day group. It is true that many of the Day Supervisors have relatively high administrative posts (e.g., 24% are directors or coordinators of special education) with correspondingly high salaries, but this in itself is not sufficient to account for the Day salary superiority, since Day Supervisors-only and Supervisor-teachers also earn more than their

Residential counterparts. There may be geographic or other types of factors operating here, or the findings may simply point up a tendency for Day programs to have higher salary schedules than Residential programs.

D. CLASSROOM VISITS: PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

Chapter VI focuses on one of the major activities of supervisors -- visiting classrooms for the deaf -- and explores time factors, scheduling practices, and procedures related to these visits. Some of the findings are summarized here.

1. Visit-time ratios. There are understandably large differences between Day and Residential supervisors on raw amounts of time devoted to visits, with Residential respondents reporting larger time amounts. To achieve more equitable comparisons, visit-time ratios were computed (similar to the supervision-time ratios discussed in the previous section) to determine for each respondent the number of hours per month per teacher spent on classroom visits. The results produced remarkably similar distributions for Day and Residential total groups and subgroups. Thus, about half of both groups reported spending 0.1 to 3.9 hours per month per teacher on visits, about 20% reported 4.0 to 7.9 hours, about 3% reported 8.0 to 11.9 hours, and less than 1% reported 12 hours or more. Eleven percent of the Day group and 12% of the Residential group (primarily Supervisor-administrators) reported no time spent on classroom visits. Among the Supervisor-types, Day S's and S(A)T's appear to devote the most time per teacher to visits, followed by Residential S's, Residential SA's, Day SA's, and Residential S(A)T's (although these results must be interpreted with caution due to the large number of Residential No Responses).

2. Number of visits per teacher. The median number of visits paid to an "average" teacher during the course of a year is 10 - 14 for the Day group, 15 - 19 for the Residential group. Supervisor-administrators tend to pay fewer visits than the Supervisors-only and the Supervisor-teachers.

3. Visit length. Almost half of the supervisors reported spending 20 - 39 minutes on "average" supervisory visits. There is some tendency for Day supervisors to spend longer periods of time per visit than do Residential supervisors and for the S's and S(A)T's of both groups to devote more time to individual visits than do the SA's.

4. Practices and procedures during visits. Lists of specific topics discussed with teachers during visits are similar for Day and Residential groups,

the most popular being "teaching techniques and materials", "behavior problems and adjustment difficulties of children", and "special techniques for specific children". Half of the respondents reported that their visits included both observation of classroom proceedings and conferences with the teacher, the former consuming around three-quarters of the time. Around a quarter of the supervisors reported that they demonstrated techniques with pupils during visits "frequently" or "very frequently", while larger percentages (D 32%, R 45%) reported doing this "occasionally".

5. **Conferences and reports**. Most of the respondents hold conferences with teachers either during or after visits, with over half stating that this was done for at least 40% of their visits and from 10% (R) to 29% (D) reporting this for 100% of their visits. Fifteen percent of the Residential supervisors and 37% of the Day supervisors stated that they prepared written reports of supervisory visits.

6. Discussion. Perhaps the most significant aspects of this chapter are the visit-time ratio distributions. It is interesting to note, for example, that slightly over 10% of both Day and Residential supervisors reported spending no time on classroom visits (with an additional 6% Day and 16% Residential supervisors not responding to this item at all). These figures should be interpreted with caution, however. It may be that some of these supervisors truly represent programs in which no classroom visitations take place. However, it is also likely, particularly since most of these "no visit" respondents are Supervisor-administrators, that their "supervisory" responsibilities are of a more generalized or administrative nature and that there are other supervisors within the same system who have the specific task of visiting teachers.

The reader should be cautioned that the visit-time ratios represent the responses of individual supervisors within various systems. One must be cautious about interpreting these figures as "amount of time each teacher is visited" because of the possibility of "responsibility overlap" (two or more supervisory persons being responsible for and visiting the same teachers). This is especially true in the case of Supervisor-administrators, as just pointed out. One may be willing to assume, however, that Supervisors-only and Supervisor-teachers are generally the sole or primary persons visiting individual classrooms for supervisory purposes, allowing an interpretation of the ratios as "amount of time each teacher is visited". If this is the case, then the resulting data are unsettling, for they would indicate that around half of the teachers of the deaf in both types of programs are receiving only 0.1 to 3.9 hours per month of visiting time (with sizeable numbers receiving only 0.1 to 1.9 hours per month). It would seem questionable as to the amount of true evaluation and guidance of teacher performance that can be accomplished in such limited periods of time.

E. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE RESPONDENTS

1. Personal characteristics. (a) Sex. For both Day and Residential groups slightly over half of the respondents are females. (b) Age. The largest number of respondents in both groups are in their 50's (D 36%, R 36%), but the Day supervisors as a group are somewhat younger than their Residential counterparts. (c) Hearing loss. Five Day respondents and 11 Residential respondents reported hearing losses, ranging from mild to profound.

2. Academic work. The bachelor's degree is the highest level reached by 9% of the Day and 19% of the Residential respondents. The majority have achieved the master's level (D 82%, R 67%), and a few have earned doctorates (D 7%, R 3%). In addition, 5% of the Day respondents are currently working on master's degrees, 7% on doctorates; the Residential percentages are 7% and 4% respectively. One Day and 15 Residential respondents left this item blank, indicating either a true No Response despite degrees held or a lack of academic degrees.

At the bachelor's level the respondents display a wide variety of areas in which academic work was done, including special education, general education, and liberal arts and sciences. At the master's level, for Day respondents, about one-fourth did work in education of the deaf, one-fourth in audiology and/or speech correction, and one-eighth each in general education and in administration. At this level, for Residential respondents, about one-third received degrees in education of the deaf, with much smaller proportions in other areas. The majority of the respondents received their degrees in education of the deaf at the master's level. However, according to supervisor reports, 47% of the Day respondents reported degree work (at any level) in education of the deaf, 17% in special education. The Residential percentages are 41% and 12 %, respectively.

Approximately 30% of the Day and Residential respondents reported taking one to four courses (credit and non credit) outside of degree work during the past ten years. Approximately 20% of both groups reported five to nine courses for this period, and less than 5% reported ten courses or more. About 14% wrote in explanatory comments for this item ("other" responses), and 20% reported no courses taken.

3. Teaching and supervisory experience. Slightly over 10% of the respondents (for both Day and Residential groups) reported up to 4 years of teaching experience with the deaf. For other categories the percentages are: 5 - 9 years, D 25%, R 23%; 10 - 14 years, D 17%, R 21%; 15 - 19 years, D 8%, R 15%; 20 - 24 years, D 5%, R 6%; 25 years or more, D 3%, R 16%. Two percent of the Residential group and 28% of the Day group (primarily Supervisor-administrators) reported no teaching experience with the deaf.

In considering types of teaching done, it was found that many Day respondents had worked with very young children and primary-age deaf children, that Day and Residential groups were somewhat similar for ages 9 to 14, and that Residential percentages were quite a bit higher for ages 15 and above. In addition, 57% of the Day and 25% of the Residential respondents reported teaching with non-deaf handicapped children. The figures for work with non-handicapped children were Day 72% and Residential 41%.

In supervisory experience in programs for the deaf, the largest percentages of respondents reported up to 4 years of experience (D 36%, R 27%), with steadily declining percentages in categories over this amount. Residential respondents as a group appear to have somewhat more experience than Day supervisors (R 45%, D 28% in categories of 10 years or more). In total experience with the deaf (teaching plus supervision), Day and Residential groups are quite similar in categories covering 10 - 24 years experience, but 41% of the Day supervisors reported fewer than 10 years of experience (R 16%), while 39% of the Residential supervisors report 25 or more years of experience (D 12%).

4. Professional activities and affiliations. Different types of professional activity were investigated. In the area of publications, approximately one-fourth of the Day and Residential respondents reported publishing articles in professional journals (the majority reporting 1 or 2 articles) and about one-fourth also reported other publications (books, chapters, monographs, special reports, etc.). In reporting participation in various types of professional

activities during a one-year period, Day and Residential response percentages are similar for "workshops and conferences" (D 56%, R 52%) and "miscellaneous activities" D 13%, R 11%). However, somewhat larger percentages of Day supervisors indicated "membership on special committees or boards" (D 49%, R 28%) and "major speaking engagements" (D 41%, R 29%).

In attendance at professional conventions and meetings over a six-year period (1960 to 1966), Day and Residential respondents were similar in that approximately one-fourth of both groups reported attendance at one or more regional meetings of the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf and one-fifth at one or more conventions of the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf. However, differences occurred in the higher percentages of Day respondents reporting attendance at one or more meetings of the American Speech and Hearing Association (D 33%, R 11%), and the Council for Exceptional Children - National (D 45%, R 21%) and the C.E.C. - State (D 56%, R 37%) and the higher percentages of Residential respondents for meetings of the American Instructors of the Deaf (D32%, R 69%), the International Congress on Education of the Deaf (D 29%, R 47%), and national conventions of the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf (D 30%, R 41%).

The majority of respondents hold membership in three or more national professional organizations, with 22% of the Day and 13% of the Residential respondents reporting membership in five or more organizations. Similar percentages of both groups are members of the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf (D 60%, R 56%), but Day respondents tend to favor the American Speech and Hearing Association (D 33%, R 15%), the Council for Exceptional Children (D 69%, R 41%), and the National Education Association (D 50%, R 24%), while the Residential group favors the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf (D 24%, R 35%) and the American Instructors of the Deaf (D 48%, R 93%).

Seventy-seven percent of the Residential respondents and 94% of the Day respondents reported holding some sort of state certification, with many holding two or more types of certification. There are differences between the two groups in percentages holding certification by the American Speech and Hearing Association (D 26%, R 11%) and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf (D 34%, R 81%).

5. Discussion. Perhaps the most puzzling statistics in this chapter are the low percentages of respondents who reported academic degrees (at any level)

in education of the deaf or in a combination of education of the deaf with some other area (D 47%, R 42%). Even when degrees in "special education" are added to these (D 17%, R 13%) the percentages are only D 54% and R 55%. And, in fact, these figures may be overestimations because of possible overlap in degree areas (e.g., respondents who may have received bachelor's degrees in education of the deaf and gone on to master's work in the same area or in "special education"). In order to verify these findings, the percentages of non-responses to the sub-item requesting a specification of "academic major" were checked and found to be extremely low. As a second precaution, all of the "other" (ambiguous or uncodable) responses to the academic major sub-item were re-checked, and the few that could be interpreted as "education of the deaf" were included in the figures cited above. It is almost to be expected in present circumstances that a large proportion of Day supervisors would not have had degree work specifically in the area of the deaf, since many work in very small programs and are also responsible for supervising teachers of non-deaf children. If their major areas of academic work were supplemented by non-degree coursework or degree-courses (e.g., electives), as might be the case in some instances, at least a degree of supervisory proficiency might be attained for advising teachers of the deaf. The paucity of degrees in education of the deaf is more difficult to explain for the Residential group, almost all of whom work exclusively in this area. The large number of degrees in general education and in academic areas leads one to believe that many of these persons gained their knowledge and skill in the area of the deaf through supplementary coursework or on-the-job experience. There may be other explanations for this phenomenon. Respondents may have unwittingly omitted the qualification "for the deaf" in specifying in their academic majors, for example, or they may have taken coursework in education of the deaf and even done practicum in this area but received degrees under designations which did not acknowledge this work. As it is designed, the questionnaire does not allow for ferreting out of these possibilities, and this situation certainly bears further investigation.

Another interesting finding relates to the respondents' number of years of experience as a teacher of the deaf. Most have had some experience, although Day supervisors tend to have less than the Residential supervisors (e.g., one-third of the Day group vs. 57% of the Residential group reported 10 years or more). The most striking statistic is the 28% of the Day supervisors with no teaching experience in an area in which they are supervising.

However, it may be noted that the majority of these are Supervisor-administrators. Since previous findings indicate that many respondents are not the sole supervisors in their systems and that some (such as Supervisor-administrators) tend to have "generalized" supervisory responsibilities while delegating "classroom" supervision to others, this high percentage is cause for concern only to the degree that these persons without teaching experience are the sole supervisors of the deaf in their programs.

In the area of professional activities and affiliations, both Day and Residential groups are fairly similar in "amounts" of activity and affiliation (e.g., number of publications, professional activities, and memberships). However, some marked differences can be seen in the nature and type of organizations to which they belong, the conventions they attend, and the groups by which they are certified. Thus, Day respondents, many of whom work with teachers of non-deaf children and have backgrounds in general education, special education, and speech and hearing, tend to gravitate toward organizations such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the American Speech and Hearing Association in conventions attended, although many also report attendance at conventions related to education of the deaf. In professional memberships approximately 70% belong to the C.E.C., 60% to the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, and 50% to the National Education Association and the American Instructors of the Deaf. Among the Residential supervisors, most of whom have a more specialized interest in the area of the deaf, 70% report attendance at conventions of the American Instructors of the Deaf, with smaller percentages for the International Congress on Education of the Deaf and the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf. In professional membership, 93% belong to the American Instructors of the Deaf, with smaller proportions belonging to the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, the Council for Exceptional Children, and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf.

F. GRADUATE PROGRAMS FOR SUPERVISORS

Items in Chapter VIII focus on the opinions and suggestions of the respondents concerning proposed supervisor preparation programs (to prepare experienced teachers of the deaf for supervisory positions) and advanced study programs (to provide supplementary work for current supervisors of teachers of the deaf).

1. Supervisor preparation programs. The majority of respondents (D 57%, R 58%) believe that 4 to 6 years is the minimal amount of teaching experience with the deaf necessary to become a supervisor. However, Day respondents tend to approve of lesser amounts of experience (1 - 3 years, D 18%, R 6%), while Residential respondents favor longer periods (7 - 9 years, D 12%, R 17%; 10 years or more, D 9%, R 36%).

In ratings of the importance of various types of programs in preparing supervisors, both groups ranked "master's programs" first, "post-master's programs" second, and "one year programs (with one or two summer sessions)" third. Day respondents ranked "doctoral programs" fourth and "summer programs (a series of summer sessions and workshops)" fifth, while the Residential group reversed this order. Around two-thirds of both groups feel that a non-doctoral program should lead to some sort of special certification.

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of various academic courses for supervisor preparation programs. Seventeen courses were listed in the areas of special education, general education, psychological areas, administration and supervision, speech and hearing, and subsidiary areas. Those considered most important by Day and Residential respondents were "Supervision", "Curriculum theory and development", "Child development; child psychology", "Learning disabilities: diagnosis and remediation", and "Reading". Respondents were also asked to rate four types of "experiences" for supervisor preparation programs. All attached the greatest importance to "Planned observations in a wide variety of programs for the deaf" and "Internship with successful, established supervisors of the deaf", with somewhat less importance given to "Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors" and "Experience in interpreting psychological, educational, and medical reports and records".

2. Advanced study programs for supervisors. The respondents, all of whom are currently supervising classes for the deaf, present a variety of backgrounds and experience. However, in one section they were asked to rate the importance of various courses and experiences for their own advanced study. The six highest-ranking courses for the total respondents are "Learning disabilities: diagnosis and remediation", "Curriculum theory and development", "Recent research in special education", "Supervision", "Reading", and "Guidance and counseling". The graduate "experience" considered most important is "Planned observations in a wide variety of programs for the deaf", followed by "Internship with successful,

established supervisors of the deaf", "Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors", and "Experience in interpreting psychological, educational, and medical reports and records".

3. Discussion. The respondents as a group have some definite ideas about the nature of supervisor preparation programs. Most feel that master's and post-master's programs, and, to a lesser extent, one-year programs, would be the preferred types of programs and that these should lead to some sort of special certification. It may be assumed that summer session programs were considered too brief and doctoral programs too extensive for the preparation of supervisors. Courses considered important for supervisor preparation were chosen from a diversity of areas. "Supervision" is an obvious first choice, but there is great emphasis on broadening the future-supervisors' backgrounds in general education (e.g., curriculum and reading) in psychological areas (child development and guidance), in areas of handicap often associated with hearing handicaps (learning disabilities and emotional disturbance), and in speech and hearing science. The practical nature of supervisory positions are reflected in the respondents' ratings indicating that supervisor trainees should be familiar with recent research in special education but need not have research skills themselves. It is rather interesting that linguistics and psycholinguistics, an area currently receiving much emphasis in the area of the deaf, is rated quite low.

In considering advanced study coursework for themselves, respondents apparently feel a strong need for work that would help them in dealing with multi-handicapped deaf children (e.g., learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, and research in special education) and for advanced work in general education (curriculum and reading). The fact that experienced teachers are often promoted to supervisory positions without specific training in this type of endeavor may be reflected in the high ratings assigned to coursework in supervision by these persons who are already engaged in supervisory work.

G. IMPLICATIONS

From the preceding chapters and from general knowledge of the field, it is apparent that there exist a number of major needs related to supervision in education of the deaf. Among these are the following.

1. The need for increased supervision in programs for the deaf. In terms of a rather liberal criterion based upon amounts of time devoted to supervision within a system, available data indicate that at least 25% of the programs (with 4 or more teachers) in the United States are currently inadequately supervised. The actual proportion is probably higher, since insufficient data precluded evaluation of half of the existing programs. Adding to this the possible proportion of inadequately-supervised programs with 3 or fewer teachers, one might conceivably discover that the majority of programs for the deaf fall below acceptable levels of supervision. This is conjecture, but it seems a distinct possibility.

A key concept here is "amount of supervision" in terms of time devoted to supervision activities within a system. Since supervisory persons often have other types of responsibilities (e.g., administration, teaching), it is not sufficient to evaluate supervision adequacy on the basis of simple numerical supervisor-teacher ratios. Rather, evaluation and planning for supervision within a program should take into account a) for each supervisor, the proportion and amount of his time devoted specifically to supervision activities and b) the amount of time per teacher which the supervisor devotes to classroom visits and teacher conferences.

There are a number of problems related to this need for increased supervision. One concerns the difficulty of providing sufficient numbers of qualified supervisors for programs, a difficulty heightened by the continuing short supply of "more basic" personnel -- teachers of the deaf. A second problem may occur in convincing administrators of the need in their programs for adequate amounts of "true supervision" by qualified supervisors. This should not be too critical in Residential and large Day programs, most of which are already attuned to the need for supervision (although data indicate that some of these programs are inadequately supervised). However, a unique situation occurs in small Day programs, for the school systems to which they belong may be hard put to justify the hiring of special supervisors for the deaf, even though the multi-area supervisors which many systems presently employ seldom have appropriate backgrounds in the area of the deaf.

2. The need to improve the quality of supervision in programs for the deaf. Increased "amounts" of supervision are of little value unless supervision is done by experienced, qualified persons with special skills in this area. From the data it is obvious that, in addition to the programs with deficient amounts of supervision, there are many "well-staffed" programs whose supervisors lack adequate backgrounds in education of the deaf. One might carry this even farther and question the quality of supervision in many programs which are both well-staffed and have supervisors with experience in education of the deaf. In the past, most supervisors have tended to be teachers of the deaf who were promoted to supervisory status on the basis of such things as a) instructional expertise, b) amount and type of experience, c) personal characteristics and abilities, d) additional knowledge and skills, and e) length of service within a system. Most would agree that factors a) through d) are important considerations in the selection of supervisors. However, if one accepts the proposition that in order to assist teachers and perform other supervisory tasks it is essential for the supervisor to have special knowledge and skills in a number of areas (e.g., work with the multiply-handicapped; curriculum theory and development; guidance and counseling; techniques of supervision; etc.), then it would appear that the very important factor d) has been given too little consideration in the past. Acceptance of this as one of the criteria for "quality supervision" may call for special programs of preparation for supervisors and re-assessment of the qualifications of present supervisors.

3. The need for setting professional standards for supervisors of teachers of the deaf. Preceding sections called attention to the need for "qualified" supervisors. However, while much work has been done in establishing standards and certification qualifications for teachers of the deaf, very little has been done in these areas for supervisory personnel. If supervisors are to achieve a professional identity of their own (distinct from those of teachers and administrators, even though supervisors may also be engaged in these roles) and if programs are to be encouraged to hire "qualified" supervisors, then a) the profession must set standards for supervisors in terms of types and amounts of professional experience and academic work and practicum; b) means must be found for helping present and future supervisors to achieve these standards; c) recognition should be given to attainment of these standards through certification or some other procedure; and d) ways should be

found to encourage state and local agencies to recognize these standards in employing supervisory personnel.

4. The need for discussion and resolution of problems and issues in supervision by professional persons in education of the deaf. Nationwide attention within the profession should be drawn to supervision needs and problems. And increased colloguy should be undertaken on issues such as those mentioned above.

There are undoubtedly other needs and issues in the area of supervision. However, on the basis of those just cited and on the basis of the results of this study and general knowledge of the field, the following recommendations are made.

In order to provide a supply of qualified supervisors for the field, (1) it is recommended that programs be established to prepare supervisors of teachers of the deaf. Furthermore, in order to upgrade quality and maintain high quality of current supervision in programs for the deaf, (2) it is recommended that programs of advanced study be established for present supervisors of teachers of the deaf. Both of these points are echoed in the recommendations of the 1967 National Conference on Education of the Deaf (Education of the Deaf. The Challenge and the Charge, pp. 95-96).

The actual programs offered in supervisor preparation and advanced study may take a variety of forms in terms of levels (master's or post-master's) and extent of time involved. Thus, preparation programs may best be geared to an academic year, particularly if the program is to include observation and some form of practicum or internship in ongoing supervision programs. Advanced study programs may also take this form or may be offered as special institutes, regular summer session programs, or in-service programs.

Program content should build upon each individual's previous experience and academic background. In order to provide the additional breadth and depth of background needed by supervisors, (3) it is recommended that preparation and advanced study programs be undertaken primarily by institutions which have post-teacher preparation programs in education of the deaf and which also have programs in other areas of special education (particularly learning disabilities and language disorders), in supervision, and in related areas (e.g., curriculum theory and development, guidance and counseling, child development, speech and hearing).

4. Within the field, nation-wide attention should be focused on supervision of teachers of the deaf. Study and discussion of supervision needs, problems, and issues leading to specific recommendations and courses of action should take place at national, regional, state, and local levels. (a) A national conference on supervision should be called within the near future. Participants should include representative persons from: the United States Bureau of Handicapped Children; state agencies concerned with special education; national organizations concerned with education of the deaf; teacher education programs and advanced study programs in education of the deaf; administrators of various types and sizes of programs for the deaf; supervisors currently engaged in programs for the deaf; and university programs in supervision of regular (non-deaf) education; (b) national organizations concerned with education of the deaf should call attention to supervision needs through their publications and meetings; (c) state and regional agencies should assess supervision needs within their areas and draw up plans for filling these needs; (d) individual programs for the deaf should evaluate the adequacy of their supervision programs and, if necessary, plan for the upgrading of these programs. In conjunction with this, small Day programs should strive to find means for providing adequate supervision by qualified personnel. The unique problems of these programs may call for exploration of various patterns of administration and supervision (e.g., consolidation of small programs into regional programs; the sharing of a supervisor by a number of individual systems through cooperative arrangements; provisions for supervision by state consultants or coordinators of education of the deaf; released time for a specially trained teacher of the deaf to serve in a supervisory capacity).

There are currently many educational systems for the deaf with adequate, perhaps even optimal, programs of supervision which are being conducted by persons well-qualified for this responsibility. The problems and recommendations above are based upon indications from study data that many more systems have inadequate provisions for supervision. It is hoped that the findings and implications of this study will stimulate increased effort toward the improvement and maintenance of quality in this key aspect of educational programs for deaf children.

III. PROCEDURES AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

Conduct of the study involved: (1) preparation of the questionnaire; (2) definition of the population; (3) location of the population; (4) collection of the data; and (5) treatment of the data.

1. Preparation of the Questionnaire. A mailed, self-administered questionnaire was used to obtain the information for the study. In developing the questionnaire, preliminary versions were submitted for review and suggestions to professional persons in education of the hearing handicapped and to individuals knowledgeable in the preparation of such instruments. The majority of items in the instrument were designed with highly-structured, multiple-choice answers. The few open-ended responses were arranged to be brief and easily answered. (Items 2.15, 2.19, 2.20, 5.8, and 7.0 were purposely-planned exceptions to this.)

The final version of the questionnaire was printed on ten double-columned pages and enclosed in covers with a spiral binding. The body of the questionnaire is Appendix A of this report. It consisted of 77 numbered items, most of which contained several sub-items. The items were grouped to elicit information in a variety of areas, and most of the answers were to be based on the 1965-66 school year. A brief description of these areas follows.

a. Qualification for inclusion in the study (Section 0.). An explanation and definition was given of "the supervisor" for whom this questionnaire was intended. Persons who did not fit this description were asked to respond to a few identifying items and then to return the incomplete questionnaire. This was essentially a cut-off section.

b. Identifying information (Section 6.). This section included items on sex (item 6.1), age (6.2), and information concerning the respondent's hearing loss, if any (6.3).

c. The nature of the supervisory position and the educational programs concerned (Sections 1. and 4.). These sections included information in the following areas: (1) type of system and related information (items 1.1, 1.2, 1.3); (2) size of program (1.4, 1.5); (3) supervisory load and types of teachers supervised (1.6, 1.7, 1.12); (4) presence of other supervisors of the deaf (1.8) and number of unsupervised teachers

(1.9); (5) ages of children and areas supervised (1.10, 1.11); (6) administrative positions held in addition to supervision (1.13, 1.14, 1.15); (7) supervisory role in the administrative organization (1.16); (8) types of teaching responsibilities (1.17, 1.18, 1.19); (9) professional school activities (4.1); (10) time basis of the supervisory position and summer responsibilities (4.2, 4.3); (11) salary and salary comparison with teachers (4.4, 4.5).

d. Supervision practices (Section 2.). This section attempted to describe the actual practices used by the respondent in carrying out his supervisory responsibilities. These areas were covered: (1) time spent in all types of supervisory activities (2.1); (2) time devoted to supervisory visits (2.2, 2.3); (3) length of visits (2.4); (4) topics discussed during visits (2.5); (5) visit activities (2.6); (6) practices followed in offering comments (2.7), holding conferences (2.8), and demonstrating teaching techniques (2.9); (7) number of visits per teacher per year (2.10); (8) scheduling of visits (2.11, 2.12); (9) written reports of visits (2.13, 2.14); (10) a non-structured response requesting a description of typical visit procedures; (11) consultations and meetings with teachers (2.16, 2.17); (12) responsibilities for student teachers (2.18); (13) a non-structured response requesting opinions on the supervisor's functions (2.19); (14) a non-structured response requesting information on problems or difficulties encountered in supervisory work (2.20).

e. Educational and professional background; professional affiliations and activities (Section 3.): (1) information concerning earned degrees, degree candidacy, and non-degree coursework (3.1, 3.2, 3.3); (2) experience as a supervisor of the deaf (3.4); (3) experience as a teacher of the deaf (3.5 to 3.8); (4) experience as a teacher of non-deaf children (3.9, 3.10); (5) other full-time professional positions (3.11); (6) articles and other materials published (3.12, 3.13); (7) attendance and participation at professional conventions and meetings (3.14); (8) membership in professional organizations (3.15); (9) participation in professional activities (3.16); (10) certifications held (3.17, 3.18, 3.19).

f. Graduate programs for supervisors (Section 5.). The following explanation was given for this section. "Some thought is currently being given to establishing graduate programs to train supervisors of the deaf. Because of your experience in education of the deaf, your opinions and ideas will undoubtedly prove of great help to institutions planning such programs."

The following areas were covered: (1) minimum amount of teaching experience necessary to become a supervisor (5.1); (2) types of graduate programs suitable for preparing supervisors (5.4, 5.5); (3) comments and suggestions concerning supervisor training and advanced study programs (5.8); (4) courses that should be included in graduate programs for supervisors (5.3, 5.6); (5) experiences that should be included in these graduate programs (5.3, 5.7).

g. Comments (Section 7.). This was intended to elicit non-structured comments and opinions concerning the supervisor project, the questionnaire, and other matters concerned with supervision.

2. Definition of the population. A previous section of this report has discussed the difficulties inherent in trying to define the "supervisor of teachers of the deaf" who was the intended focus of this study. A functional definition was thus formulated to identify as precisely as possible the individuals whose questionnaire responses form the basis for this report. For the purposes of this study, then, a "supervisor of teachers of the deaf" is defined as:

(1) "an individual, with or without the title 'supervisor',
(2) whose responsibilities, either fully or in part, include
(3) supervision of academic teachers of the deaf (including preschool levels) in classroom settings
(4) in an educational program with four or more teachers of the deaf."

It was felt unwise to pursue the technicalities involved in specifying degrees of "deafness" in the term "teachers of the deaf"; this was left to the judgment of the respondents. Factor (3) was intended to exclude supervisors of vocational areas, art, physical education, and similar areas, since their positions and functions often differ sharply from those of the supervisor of academic classroom teachers. Criterion (4) may appear rather arbitrary. It was based on examination of program sizes as reported in the January, 1965, American Annals of the Deaf directory issue, which revealed that almost half of the listed Day schools and programs in the United States employed three or fewer teachers. Inclusion of all of these programs, or even those with three teachers, would have greatly increased the number of individuals to be contacted, severely taxing the logistic resources of this investigation. Additionally, it was felt that the informational payoff might not justify the effort, since programs of this size were less likely to have supervisors specifically assigned to classes for the deaf.

3. Location of the population. Since there were no available listings of supervisors as such, it was decided to seek these names from administrators. The January, 1965, directory issue of the *American Annals of the Deaf*, listed 223 programs with four or more teachers of the deaf. In April, 1965, the administrators listed for these programs were contacted. Each received a letter explaining the project and a referral form for reporting the names of supervisors in his program. In November, 1965, a follow-up mailing was sent to those who had not yet responded. A number of responses from administrators indicated that their programs had fewer than four teachers, and, in some instances the 1966 *Annals* directory showed three or fewer teachers for programs which had reported four or more in the 1965 *Annals*. These programs were later eliminated as results were being compiled, reducing the total number of programs with four or more teachers from 223 to 205. Table 1 shows the resulting number of programs in each of five categories and the final number of forms returned by administrators from each type of school. The overall response rate from administrators was 93%.

Table 1. Response rate from administrators of programs with four or more teachers of the deaf

	Administrators contacted		Responses: forms returned	
Type of program	No.	% of total (205)	No.	% of total (205)
Public residential	66	32%	65	32%
Private residential	12	6%	11	5%
Public day schools	13	6%	12	6%
Public day classes	96	47%	88	43%
Private day programs	18	9%	15	7%
Totals	205	100%	191	93%

4. Collection of the data. By the end of 1965, approximately 360 persons had been named as supervisors in forms returned by administrators. In December, 1965, each of these individuals was sent a questionnaire along with an explanatory letter and a form on which the respondent could request a copy of the final report. In March, 1966, a follow-up request was sent to persons who had not yet responded to the first requests. This second mailing consisted of a short-form of the questionnaire (items 0.1 through 1.6), a form for requesting another copy of the questionnaire in case the first had been misplaced, and spaces for the supervisor to refer persons other than himself who were responsible for supervision. This latter listing plus the continuing responses of administrators during first few months of 1966 provided the names of nearly 40 additional supervisors, and questionnaires were sent to these persons.

A total of 398 questionnaires had been mailed by the spring of 1966. Of these, 170 (43%) went to individuals in Day programs and 228 (57%) to individuals in Residential programs. Table 2 indicates the number of persons contacted in five types of programs and also shows the number of programs represented by one or more individuals contacted.

Table 2. Number of individuals and programs represented in questionnaire mailings

Type of program	Number of individuals sent questionnaires	% of total individuals (398)	Number of programs represented	% of total programs (182)
Public residential	212	53%	65	36%
Private residential	16	4%	8	4%
Public day schools	18	5%	11	6%
Public day classes	137	34%	83	46%
Private day programs	15	4%	15	8%
Totals	398	100%	182	100%

Table 3 presents information concerning responses received and questionnaires actually used. (Since the number of individuals and programs in three of the program-types are small, the programs are consolidated into two major groupings -- Day and Residential -- in the remainder of the study.)

"Responses" refers to all types of feedback from supervisors contacted and includes usable, incomplete, and unusable returned questionnaires as well as follow-up short forms which were returned. Responses were received from 82% of the persons in Day programs and from 85% of those in Residential programs for a total response rate of 83%.

Table 3. Returned, unreturned, and unusable responses

	Day Supervisors		Residential Supervisors		Total Supervisors	
	No.	% of 170	No.	% of 228	No.	% of 398
Questionnaires not returned	31	18%	35	15%	66	17%
Questionnaires or short-forms returned but not used:						
a) Respondents did not currently supervise teachers of the deaf	16	9%	21	9%	37	9%
b) Respondents supervised only non-academic classes	9	5%	4	2%	13	3%
c) Returned questionnaires incomplete	6	4%	18	8%	24	6%
Questionnaires returned and used in the study	108	64%	150	66%	258	65%
Total questionnaires sent	170	100%	228	100%	398	100%

A number of responses could not be used for one or more of the following reasons: (a) the individual reported that he was not currently a supervisor of teachers of the deaf, although typically he had done so in the past; (b) the individual did not supervise academic classes of deaf children but worked with other types of classes for the deaf; and (c) the individual's returned questionnaire was incomplete in that a previously-set criterion of 75% items completed was not met. Table 3 tallies these unusable responses.

The number of completed questionnaires finally used in the study was 258. One hundred eight or 42% of these were received from Day supervisors; 150 or 58% were from Residential supervisors. These respondents represent 65% of the total 398 persons who were originally sent questionnaires.

5. Treatment of the data. All questionnaires which were received before the cut-off date of June 1, 1966, were evaluated for inclusion in the study. The data in the questionnaires were coded on Digitek forms and subsequently transferred to IBM cards. Frequency distributions using a variety of control variables were obtained by use of the IBM 7094 computer at the University of Illinois.

B. CATEGORIZATION OF THE DATA

In order to categorize the data in a meaningful way for presentation in frequency distributions, appropriate parameters had to be selected. In doing so, the attempt was made to maintain a tractible number of variables while including a sufficient number of factors important to interpretation of the data. Control variables were: (a) type of program (Day or Residential); (b) program sizes; (c) amounts of time devoted to supervision; and (d) supervisor-types. All four factors are used in the discussion of "patterns of supervision" in the next chapter; (a) and (d) are the primary ones used for the major part of the study. The four factors are discussed below.

1. Type of program. While Day and Residential programs are similar in many respects, there are some typical differences between the two types of programs in terms of average size, physical arrangement of facilities, administrative characteristics, age ranges of children, and types of supervisors employed, to name but a few. Thus, it was felt that the Day-Residential distinction would be a useful one in examining patterns of supervision.

2. Program size is based on the total number of teachers within the system as reported for the 1965-1966 school year in the January 1966 directory issue of the American Annals of the Deaf. An alternative would have been to use pupil population as a size index; however, teacher numbers seemed more relevant to supervision than student numbers.

Groupings were used to facilitate presentation of data. Criteria for setting up the program size-categories took into account: (a) the range of teacher population sizes; (b) the numbers of programs qualifying for each category; (c) equality of group sizes for the two types of programs; and

(d) the number of groupings considered feasible for presenting data. Thus, the Residential schools distributed themselves in the following way: 4 - 9 teachers; 10 - 19 teachers; 20 - 29 teachers; 30 - 39 teachers; ... with similar size-groupings up to 90 or more teachers. Although some size-categories contained very few programs, it was felt that sufficient differences in supervisory requirements existed between a program of, say, 71 and one of 89 teachers to justify at least these somewhat gross groupings by 10's.

Day programs are typically smaller than Residential ones, and different groupings were called for. The afore-mentioned criteria were used in selecting categories, but this time with less of an eye to different supervisory requirements, since one supervisor may quite adequately serve programs with five, ten, or more teachers, depending upon the amount of time devoted to supervision. More weight was given to the number of programs at different size levels. Day programs of less than twenty teachers, then, were put into fairly arbitrary groupings, while the larger programs used the same groupings as those for Residential programs. The size-categories used were: 4 to 6 teachers; 7 to 9 teachers; 10 to 14 teachers; 15 to 19 teachers; 20 - 29 teachers; and 30 or more teachers.

3. Time devoted to supervisory activities. This information was based upon responses to questionnaire item 2.1, which asked the respondent: "How many hours do you spend (on the average) in all types of activities connected with your position as a supervisor of teachers of the deaf?" It must be borne in mind that this "supervision-time" is actually a very inclusive notion and is based on undefined "supervision activities," not just upon "classroom visits," although the latter undoubtedly figure prominently in activities related to supervision. The reason for using this broad interpretation is partly due to the fact that some respondents reported little or no time devoted to visits and partly due to the observation that "supervision" often includes non-visit activities which are strongly related to improvement of the instructional program. The answer to this item could be given in terms of hours per month or hours per week, which were converted to hours per month to standardize the data. For purposes of grouping, the following categories were chosen: (1) 3/4 - full time (120 or more hours per month); 1/2 - 3/4 time (80 to 119 hrs./mo.); 1/4 - 1/2 time (40 to 70 hrs./mo.); and 1/4 time or less (less than 40 hrs./mo.). The category "Unknown Time" was used for respondents who did not respond to item 2.1.

4. *Supervisor-types*. Preliminary reading of questionnaire responses revealed that the designation "supervisor of classes for the deaf" applied to a population of individuals with a wide variety of actual job responsibilities. For example, the position of a person with full-time supervision responsibility in a program for the deaf (generally someone with a background of classroom work with the deaf) is not truly comparable to a position of, say, a director of special education who has had no experience with the deaf and who devotes a few hours a week to supervision of teachers of the deaf. For this reason, four types of job responsibility were chosen as based on respondents' answers to certain questionnaire items. These responsibilities and their codings are:

s: supervision of teachers of the deaf
s: supervision of teachers of the deaf and supervision of teachers of the non-deaf handicapped and/or non-handicapped
A: administration
T: teaching of deaf children (full or part time)

In Chapter IV on "patterns of supervision" it was necessary to recognize various combinations of these job responsibilities, and therefore the following eight supervisor-types were used.

Symbols	Referent term	Symbols	Referent term
s *s*	Supervisor-only	sT *s*T	Supervisor-teacher
sA *s*A	Supervisor-administrator	sAT *s*AT	Supervisor-administrator-teacher

For the remainder of the study, it was deemed unfeasible to use eight categories in presenting data. Since supervision of other types of teachers seemed of limited relevance for most analyses, the "s" and "*s*" categories were combined into one: "S". The small numbers of Supervisor-teachers and Supervisor-administrator-teachers likewise led to the combination of these two categories. The resulting categories and their symbols are as follows:

Symbol	Referent term	Explanation
S	Supervisors-only or S subgroup	Persons whose primary responsibility is supervision; all supervise teachers of the deaf; some also supervise teachers of the non-deaf
SA	Supervisor-administrators or SA subgroup	"S" responsibilities plus specific administrative responsibilities (e.g., principal, assistant-superintendent, director of special education, etc.)
S(A)T	Supervisor-teachers or S(A)T subgroup	"S" responsibilities in addition to teaching the deaf (full or part time); some individuals (hence the parentheses) also have administrative responsibilities

C. PROGRAM AND SUPERVISOR REPRESENTATION IN THE STUDY

In questionnaire projects such as this, the respondents who returned usable questionnaires represent only a sampling of the total population under study. Since it is desirable that the discussion and conclusions be as generalizable to the entire field as much as possible, a legitimate point to be raised is the degree of program and supervisor representation in the study.

1. Program representation. Table 4 reveals that, out of a total 205 programs for the deaf with 4 or more teachers, 146 or 71% are represented in the study. Of these 146 programs, 93 or 64% are "fully represented" (i.e., all supervisors in these programs returned usable questionnaires). Fifty-three or 36% are "partially represented" (i.e., one or more, but not all, supervisors in these programs returned usable questionnaires).

When programs are arranged according to size-categories, as in Table 4, it can be seen that Day programs tend to be rather small -- of the total 127 Day programs, almost 40% have 4 to 6 teachers of the deaf, 25% have 7 - 9 teachers, and 36% have 10 or more teachers. Fortunately, these proportions are maintained fairly well in the programs of various size-categories that are represented in the study. The large number of fully-represented Day programs is probably attributable to the many programs with one or two supervisors.

Residential programs are more evenly distributed over the various size-categories, although the largest numbers of programs are concentrated in

Table 4. Representation in the study of programs of various size-categories

Size-categories	Pgms. in Size-Category[1]	% of Total Pgms.	No. Pgms. Repres. in Study[2]	% of Pgms. in Size-Category	% of Total Repres. Pgms.	No. Fully Repres. Pgms.[3]	No. Partially-Repres. Pgms.[4]
		(N127)			(N83)		
	Day programs						
A. 4-6 teachers	50	39%	26	52%	31%	22	4
B. 7-9 teachers	32	25%	26	81%	31%	22	4
C. 10-14 teachers	15	12%	10	67%	12%	8	2
D. 15-19 teachers	11	9%	8	73%	10%	5	3
E. 20-29 teachers	11	9%	8	73%	10%	7	1
F. 30 or more tchrs.	8	6%	5	63%	6%	2	3
Subtotals[5]	127	100%	83 (63% of total 127 Day programs)		100%	66	17
	Residential programs						
		(N78)			(N63)		
A. 4-9 teachers	5	6%	2	40%	3%	1	1
B. 10-19 teachers	13	17%	11	85%	17%	6	5
C. 20-29 teachers	14	18%	10	70%	16%	8	2
D. 30-39 teachers	13	17%	10	77%	16%	6	4
E. 40-49 teachers	9	12%	9	100%	14%	2	7
F. 50-59 teachers	4	5%	4	100%	6%	2	2
G. 60-69 teachers	6	8%	3	50%	5%	1	2
H. 70-79 teachers	7	9%	7	100%	11%	1	6
I. 80-89 teachers	4	5%	4	100%	6%	0	4
J. 90 or more tchrs.	3	4%	3	100%	5%	0	3
Subtotals[5]	78	100%	63 (81% of total 78 Res. programs)		100%	27	36
Totals (Day and Res)	205		146 (71% of total 205 Day and Res. programs)			93	53

[1] Based on teacher-number listings in January, 1966, Directory Issue of the American Annals of the Deaf

[2] Programs represented by one or more supervisor who returned usable questionnaires

[3] Programs for which all supervisors in the program returned usable questionnaires

[4] Programs for which one or more, but not all, supervisors returned usable questionnaires

[5] Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Table 5. Supervisor representation in the study

Size-categories	Number of Reported Supervisors in Size-Category[1]	% of Total Reported Supervisors	Number of Supervisors Represented in Study[2]	% of Total Supervisors in Size-Category	% of Total Supervisors Represented in Study
	Day programs	(N170)			(N108)
A. 4-6 teachers	43	25%	28	65%	26%
B. 7-9 teachers	46	27%	34	74%	31%
C. 10-14 teachers	16	9%	13	81%	12%
D. 15-19 teachers	23	14%	11	48%	10%
E. 20-29 teachers	11	7%	9	82%	8%
F. 30 or more tchrs.	31	18%	13	42%	12%
Subtotals[3]	170	100%	108 (64% of total 170 Day supervisors)		100%
	Residential programs	(N228)			(N150)
A. 4-9 teachers	5	2%	3	60%	2%
B. 10-19 teachers	21	9%	14	67%	9%
C. 20-29 teachers	23	10%	14	61%	9%
D. 30-39 teachers	35	15%	23	66%	15%
E. 40-49 teachers	30	13%	22	73%	15%
F. 50-59 teachers	18	8%	15	83%	10%
G. 60-69 teachers	18	8%	8	44%	5%
H. 70-79 teachers	40	18%	29	73%	19%
I. 80-89 teachers	22	10%	12	55%	8%
J. 90 or more tchrs.	16	7%	10	63%	7%
Subtotal[3]	228	100%	150 (66% of total 228 Res. supervisors)		100%
Totals (Day and Res.)	398		258 (65% of total 398 supervisors reported)		

[1] Based on reports from administrators

[2] Numbers of supervisors who returned usable questionnaires

[3] Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

categories with 10 to 49 teachers of the deaf. Here again, the proportions of programs of various sizes are maintained quite well in the distribution of programs in the study. The rather small number of fully-represented programs reflects the unlikelihood of receiving usable questionnaires from all supervisors in programs that frequently have four or more supervisory personnel.

2. Supervisor representation. Table 5 shows that, out of a total of 398 supervisors reported by administrators of programs for the deaf, 258 or 65% are represented in the study. In comparing total supervisors reported by administrators to total supervisors represented in the study for Day and Residential groups, it can be seen that the percentages are nearly equal for both groups (Day 170/108 or 64%; Residential 228/150 or 66%). Thus, the proportion of Day-to-Residential supervisors in the reported population is maintained almost exactly in the sampling of supervisors represented in the study. In addition, a comparison of columns 2 and 5 in Table 5 reveals that the representation of supervisor-respondents from programs of various sizes is quite similar to the percentages of these supervisors that occur in the reported population.

IV. SUPERVISION PATTERNS IN PROGRAMS FOR THE DEAF

The questionnaire and the major share of this study focus on supervisors -- their positions, practices, and characteristics. However, the responses of administrators and supervisors made available a fund of information on the extent and nature of supervision in programs for the deaf. This chapter explores various supervision patterns revealed by these data.

A. REPORTED NUMBERS OF SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

A gross indication of the "extent" of supervision can be gleaned from the original letter mailings, in which each administrator was asked to list persons supervising teachers of the deaf in his program. (Selection of "supervisors" was to be guided by the definition cited in the previous chapter.) The high response rate of 93% to these original mailings assured nearly complete coverage of all programs with four or more teachers. If only for this reason, the responses of the administrators would seem to warrant some consideration, even though the discussion in this section must be limited to sheer "numbers" of reported supervisors, without any indication of supervisor-types or amounts of time devoted to supervision.

Administrator responses for individual programs are tabulated in Appendix B. In Table 6 the results are summarized by program size and by number of supervisors reported. A number of patterns can be seen in these data.

1. Programs with no supervisors. Of the total 205 programs, 13 Day and 3 Residential programs reported having no one responsible for supervision of the teachers of the deaf. Most of these Day programs are very small, with 4 - 6 teachers, but one has 20 - 29 teachers. Two of the Residential programs have 4 - 9 teachers, the other has 20 - 29 teachers.

2. Day Programs. The majority (56%) of the total Day programs have one supervisor, but this appears related somewhat to program size. Thus, of the 4 - 9 teacher programs 61% reported one supervisor; for programs with 10 - 19 teachers the figure is 46%; and for programs with 30 or more teachers the figure is 13%. This trend is disrupted by the 20 - 29 teacher programs, 73% of which reported one supervisory person.

Thirteen percent of the total Day programs reported two supervisors, and another 13% reported 3 or more supervisors. The existence of two or more

Table 6. Numbers of supervisors reported by administrators for programs of various sizes

Size-categories	No. of Programs in Size-Category	No. of Programs Reporting Various Numbers of Supervisors												Total No. Supervisors Reported
		Number of Supervisors:												
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	NR	
		Number of Programs:												
		Day programs												
A. 4-6 teachers	50	8	28	6	1								7	43
B. 7-9 teachers	32	1	22	5	1		1	1					1	46
C. 10-14 teachers	15	3	7	1	1	1							2	16
D. 15-19 teachers	11		5	3	1	1	1							23
E. 20-29 teachers	11	1	8		1								1	11
F. 30 or more	8		1	1	1	2			1			1	1	31
Subtotals	127	13	71	16	6	4	2	1	1			1	12	170
% of 127 Day Programs*	100%	10%	56%	13%	5%	3%	2%	1%	1%			1%	9%	
		Residential programs												
A. 4-9 teachers	5	2	2		1									5
B. 10-19 teachers	13		6	3	3								1	21
C. 20-29 teachers	14	1	7	3	2	1								23
D. 30-39 teachers	13		1	6	4		2							35
E. 40-49 teachers	9			2	4	2		1						30
F. 50-59 teachers	4				1	1	1	1						18
G. 60-69 teachers	6			1	1	2	1						1	18
H. 70-79 teachers	7					2	1	2	1	1				40
I. 80-89 teachers	4					2		1		1				22
J. 90 or more	3					2				1				16
Subtotals	78	3	16	15	16	12	5	5	1	3			2	228
% of 78 Res.Programs*	100%	4%	21%	19%	21%	15%	6%	6%	2%	4%			3%	
Totals	205	16	87	31	22	16	7	6	2	3		1	14	398
% of Total 205 Programs *	100%	8%	42%	15%	11%	8%	4%	3%	1%	1%		1%	7%	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

supervisors appears related to program size, for this is true of 18% of the programs with 4 - 9 teachers, 35% of those with 10 - 19 teachers, and 75% of those with 30 or more teachers. The exceptions again are the programs with 20 - 29 teachers: only 1 out of 8 programs reported more than one supervisor.

One may speculate on the interpretation of supervisor numbers given by a few of the programs. Thus, it may be necessary for programs with 30 or more teachers of the deaf to employ 4, 7, or even 10 supervisory persons. But it is somewhat difficult to understand the reporting of 3 supervisors in a 4 - 6 teacher program and for 3 to 6 supervisors in 7 - 9 teacher programs. It is possible that some of these individuals did not actually fit the specified definition of a "supervisor" or that some have "indirect" supervisory responsibilities or primarily administrative responsibilities.

3. Residential programs. There is a consistent trend for the number of supervisors per program to increase with the size of programs. For instance, if one divides the number of reported supervisors by the number of programs in a various size-category (Table 6), the following averages result: 4 - 19 teachers, 1.4 (supervisors per program); 20 - 29 teachers, 2.1; 40 - 59 teachers, 3.7; 60 - 79 teachers, 4.5; and 80 or more teachers, 5.4.

Approximately one-fifth of the Residential programs reported only one supervisory person. This is not unexpected and in fact is quite common in programs with less than 20 teachers. But it is somewhat surprising to find that half of the 20 - 29 teacher programs and one of the 30 - 39 teacher programs reported a single supervisor.

B. SUPERVISION PATTERNS: SUPERVISOR-TYPES AND SUPERVISION-TIMES

It would be desirable to present an accurate, comprehensive picture of the "extent" and "nature" of supervision currently being done in programs for the deaf. However, these are rather ambiguous concepts, and a truly comprehensive description would require knowing, at a minimum, a) the supervisor-types and supervision-time b) for each supervisor c) in every program for the deaf. This study cannot adequately fulfill these criteria, since many programs are not represented at all or are only partially represented due to the return of usable questionnaires by only a portion of their supervisory personnel. Despite these drawbacks, it is possible to get some indication -- although a limited one -- of the extent and nature of supervision by considering patterns of supervision as revealed by the responses of supervisors from programs of various types and sizes.

1. *Supervisor-types* (*Table 7*).

a. *Day programs*. (1) Of the total 108 Day supervisors, almost half (47%) are responsible for supervising other types of teachers in addition to teachers of the deaf (*s*, *s*A, *s*T, *s*AT). There is apparently some relation to program size, for while around half of the supervisors in programs with fewer than 20 teachers have this additional responsibility, very few do in programs with 20 or more teachers. (2) Over half (56%) of the Day respondents are Supervisor-administrators (sA and *s*A). The proportion of these persons in programs does not appear to be related to program size in any consistent way. Approximately half of these Supervisor-administrators work only with teachers of the deaf. (3) The next largest group (23%) consists of Supervisors-only (s and *s*). They account for at least one-third of the respondents in programs with 10 - 29 teachers but far smaller proportions in very small and very large programs. About half of these Supervisors-only work exclusively with teachers of the deaf. (4) The remaining supervisor-types, Supervisor-teachers and Supervisor-(administrator)-teachers, (sT, *s*T, sAT, *s*AT) account for 21% of the total Day respondents. Almost 80% are employed in small programs (4 - 9 teachers), and around 80% work only with teachers of the deaf. (5) Looking at supervisor-types in terms of program sizes, some general trends can be seen. For the smaller programs (4 - 9 teachers) the largest proportion of personnel consists of Supervisor-administrators, a majority of whom also have responsibility for other types of teachers; Supervisor-(administrator)-teachers are the next largest group, but few of these work with other types of teachers; Supervisors-only comprise the smallest group, with most also responsible for other types of teachers. In the programs with 10 - 19 teachers Supervisor-administrators again comprise the largest group, about half of these responsible only for teachers of the deaf; Supervisors-only are the next largest group, the majority working only with teachers of the deaf; there are only two Supervisor-teachers in

Table 7. Supervisor-types[1] in Day and Residential programs of various sizes

Supervision-types	Day Programs 4-6 Teachers No.	%	7-9 Teachers No.	%	10-14 Teachers No.	%	15-19 Teachers No.	%	20-29 Teachers No.	%	30 or more Teachers No.	%	Total Day Programs No.	%
	Number of supervisor-respondents:													
s	1	4%	0	0%	4	31%	2	18%	4	44%	1	8%	12	11%
$\underline{s}$	5	18%	3	9%	1	8%	2	18%	2	22%	0	0%	13	12%
sA	5	18%	6	18%	3	23%	3	27%	2	22%	9	69%	28	26%
$\underline{s}$A	7	25%	17	50%	3	23%	4	36%	0	0%	1	8%	32	30%
sT	4	14%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	1	8%	9	8%
$\underline{s}$T	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%
sAT	4	14%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	9	8%
$\underline{s}$AT	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%
Totals[2]	28		34		13		11		9		13		108	

Supervision-types	Residential Programs 4-19 Teachers No.	%	20-29 Teachers No.	%	30-39 Teachers No.	%	40-49 Teachers No.	%	50-59 Teachers No.	%	60-69 Teachers No.	%	70-79 Teachers No.	%	80-89 Teachers No.	%	90 or more Teachers No.	%	Total Res. Programs No.	%
	Number of supervisor-respondents:																			
s	1	6%	3	21%	3	13%	8	36%	5	33%	1	13%	14	48%	6	50%	4	40%	45	30%
$\underline{s}$	1	6%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%
sA	5	29%	7	50%	11	48%	9	41%	9	60%	6	75%	13	45%	6	50%	5	50%	71	47%
$\underline{s}$A	1	6%	3	21%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	4%
sT	5	29%	0	0%	5	17%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	11	7%
$\underline{s}$T	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
sAT	4	24%	1	7%	1	4%	4	18%	1	7%	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%	1	10%	14	9%
$\underline{s}$AT	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Totals[2]	17		14		23		22		15		8		29		12		10		150	

[1] Supervisor-types involve combinations of the following symbols: s - supervisor of teachers of the deaf; $\underline{s}$ - supervisor of teachers of the deaf and other teachers; A - administrator; T - teacher of the deaf (full or part time)

[2] Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

this size-category. In the larger programs (20 or more teachers), outside of the fact that almost all of these persons work only with teachers of the deaf, there are quite different patterns for supervisor-respondents in the 20 - 29 teacher category and in the 30 or more teacher category (perhaps due to the poor representation of reported supervisors in the latter category); in the former group, 6 out of 9 respondents are Supervisors-only, two are sA's, and one is an sT; in programs with 30 or more teachers, ten of the thirteen are Supervisor-administrators, with one s, one sT, and one sAT.

b. Residential programs. (1) Table 7 shows, that, unlike the pattern in Day programs, 93% of the total 150 Residential supervisor-respondents are responsible only for teachers of the deaf. All but one of the 9 persons who work with other types of teachers are in programs with less than 40 teachers. (2) As in the Day programs, over half (51%) of the total Residential respondents are Supervisor-administrators, although the proportion of sA's is much less than half in the size-categories 4 - 19 teachers and 40 - 49 teachers. (3) Supervisors-only, the next largest group, account for nearly one-third (32%) of the total respondents, but this figure does not reflect the larger proportions of these persons in programs with 40 or more teachers. (4) Supervisor-(administrator)-teachers (sT and sAT) comprise only 16% of the total Residential group. All work exclusively with teachers of the deaf, and the great majority are in programs with fewer than 50 teachers. (5) In terms of program sizes, there appears a tendency for smaller programs (fewer than 50 teachers) to employ large proportions of Supervisor-administrators, Supervisor-teachers and Supervisor-(administrator)-teachers but few Supervisors-only. For larger programs, the proportion of sA's is similar, but the proportion of Supervisors-only is larger and there are few sT's or sAT's.

2. Supervision-time. The figures in Table 8 represent supervision-times reported by individual respondents in programs of various sizes. It might be well to reiterate here a point made earlier -- that "supervision time" refers to the proportion of a supervisor's time which is devoted to all supervisory activities related to the program for the deaf (including, but not consisting exclusively of, classroom visits). It should also be

Table 8. Supervision-times[1] for supervisors in Day and Residential programs of various sizes

Supervision-times	Day Programs 4-6 Teachers		5-9 Teachers		10-14 Teachers		15-19 Teachers		20-29 Teachers		30 or more Teachers		Total Day Programs	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Number of supervisor-respondents:													
3/4-full time	8	29%	8	24%	6	46%	5	45%	4	44%	2	15%	33	31%
1/2-3/4 time	5	18%	3	9%	4	31%	1	9%	2	22%	4	31%	19	18%
1/4-1/2 time	3	11%	4	12%	1	8%	5	45%	3	33%	2	15%	18	17%
1/4 time or less	11	39%	19	56%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3	23%	35	32%
Unknown time	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%	3	3%
Totals[2]	28		34		13		11		9		13		108	

	Residential Programs 4-19 Teachers		20-29 Teachers		30-39 Teachers		40-49 Teachers		50-59 Teachers		60-69 Teachers		70-79 Teachers		80-89 Teachers		90 or more Teachers		Total Res. Programs	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Number of supervisor-respondents:																			
3/4-full time	7	41%	9	64%	11	48%	16	73%	12	80%	6	75%	24	83%	7	58%	6	60%	98	65%
1/2-3/4 time	1	6%	0	0%	2	9%	3	14%	0	0%	1	13%	2	7%	2	17%	1	10%	12	8%
1/4-1/2 time	1	6%	3	21%	7	30%	2	9%	2	14%	1	13%	2	7%	1	8%	2	20%	21	14%
1/4 time or less	6	35%	1	7%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	9	6%
Unknown time	2	12%	1	7%	3	13%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	1	3%	2	17%	0	0%	10	7%
Totals[2]	17		14		23		22		15		8		29		12		10		150	

---

[1] Supervision-time is based on "time devoted to all supervisory activities related to the program for the deaf." 3/4-full time is equivalent to 120 or more hours per month; 1/2-3/4 time to 80-119 hrs./mo.; 1/4-1/2 time to 40-79 hrs./mo.; 1/4 time or less to less than 40 hrs./mo. "Unknown time" indicates no response to this questionnaire item.

[2] Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

mentioned that the figures are not strict indicators of the "amount" of supervisory work going on in programs except in the case of one-supervisor programs (which are automatically fully-represented and have only one time amount to consider). For multiple-supervisor programs one would need to combine the times reported by all of the supervisors to get a true picture of the total amount of supervision. This could be done for fully represented programs by consulting tables in Appendix B. It would prove impossible for partially-represented programs.

a. Day programs. (1) Of the 108 Day supervisor-respondents, around one-third (31%) report 3/4-full time, one-sixth (18%) report 1/2-3/4 time, another sixth (17%) report 1/4-1/2 time, and a third (32%) spend 1/4 time or less. (2) There are some definite trends in size categories ranging from 4 to 29 teachers. The proportion of 3/4-full time supervisors tends to increase with the size of the program, from around 25% in smaller programs to about 45% in the larger programs. The same trend occurs for 1/4-1/2 time persons, from 11% (4 - 6 teachers) to 45% (15 - 19 teachers) and 33% (20 - 29 teachers). The proportion of 1/4 or less time supervisors shows a reverse trend, with 39% in 4 - 6 teacher programs, 56% in 7 - 9 teacher programs, 15% in 10 - 14 teacher programs, and none in the larger programs. The 1/2-3/4 time category shows no consistent trends. (3) The largest Day size-category, 30 or more teachers, does not follow the trends just mentioned, having a fairly equal distribution of supervisors in all four supervision-time categories.

b. Residential programs. (1) Nearly two-thirds of the total 150 Residential supervisor-respondents report devoting 3/4-full time to supervisory activities, with 8% reporting 1/2-3/4 time, 14% 1/4-1/2 time, and 6% reporting 1/4 time or less. Discounting the 4 - 9 teacher group, with only two programs represented, the 3/4-full time persons account for at least half of the supervisors in every size-category. In addition, for this time-group there is a gradual rise in percentage from small programs (consecutively, 64%, 48%, 73%) to the programs with 50 - 79 teachers (80%, 75%, 83%), with a decreasing trend in the very large programs (58%, 60%). (2) Seven of the nine

Table 9a. Day programs and supervisors: distribution of supervisor-respondents according to program-size category, supervisor-type, and time devoted to supervision

Pgm. Size-Category	S. Time	Supervisor-types[1] s	s̲	sA	s̲A	sT	s̲T	sAT	s̲AT	Tot.	Supervision Time[2] 3/4-Full	1/2-3/4	1/4-1/2	1/4, Less	Unknown Time
A. 4-6 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	1	1	2		1		1	2	8	8				
	1/2 - 3/4		1	2		1		1		5		5			
	1/4 - 1/2					1		2		3			3		
	1/4 or less		3	1	6	1				11				11	
	Unknown				1					1					1
Subtotals		1	5	5	7	4	0	4	2	28					
B. 7-9 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full		2	1	1			3	1	8	8				
	1/2 - 3/4			1	2					3		3			
	1/4 - 1/2			2	1	1				4			4		
	1/4 or less		1	2	13	2		1		19				19	
	Unknown									0					0
Subtotals		0	3	6	17	3	0	4	1	34					
C. 10-14 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	3	1	1			1			6	6				
	1/2 - 3/4	1			2		1			4		4			
	1/4 - 1/2			1						1			1		
	1/4 or less			1	1					2				2	
	Unknown									0					0
Subtotals		4	1	3	3	0	2	0	0	13					
D. 15-19 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	2		2	1					5	5				
	1/2 - 3/4		1							1		1			
	1/4 - 1/2		1	1	3					5			5		
	1/4 or less									0				0	
	Unknown									0					0
Subtotals		2	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	11					
E. 20-29 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	4								4	4				
	1/2 - 3/4			2						2		2			
	1/4 - 1/2		2			1				3			3		
	1/4 or less									0				0	
	Unknown									0					0
Subtotals		4	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	9					
F. 30 or more	3/4 - Full	1			1					2	2				
	1/2 - 3/4			3				1		4		4			
	1/4 - 1/2			2						2			2		
	1/4 or less			2		1				3				3	
	Unknown			2						2					2
Subtotals		1	0	9	1	1	0	1	0	13					
Totals		12	13	28	32	9	2	9	3	108	33	19	18	35	3

Total Day Supervisor-Respondents

Supervision Time: / Supervisor-types:	3/4-Full	1/2-3/4	1/4-1/2	1/4, Less	Unknown Time
s	11	1			
s̲	4	2	3	4	
sA	6	8	6	6	2
s̲A	3	4	4	20	1
sT	1	1	3	4	
s̲T	1	1			
sAT	4	2	2	1	
s̲AT	3				

---

[1] Supervisor-types. s: supervisor of teachers of the deaf; s̲: supervisors of teachers of the deaf and others; A: administrator; T: teacher of the deaf. Combinations represent combinations of job-responsibilities.

[2] Supervision-time: time devoted to all activities related to the program for the deaf. 3/4-Full Time: 120 or more hours per month; 1/2-3/4 Time: 80-119 hrs./mo.; 1/4-1/2 Time: 40-79 hrs./mo.; 1/4 Time or Less: 39 or less hrs./mo.; Unknown Time: time amount not reported.

Table 9b. Residential programs and supervisors: distribution of supervisor-respondents according to program-size category, supervisor-type, and time devoted to supervision

Pgm. Size-Category	S. Time	Supervisor-types[1] s	s̲	sA	s̲A	sT	s̲T	sAT	s̲AT	Tot.	Supervision Time[2] 3/4-Full	1/2-3/4	1/4-1/2	1/4, Less	Un-known Time
A. 4-9 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	1		3	1			2		7	7				
B. 10-19 Tchrs.	1/2 - 3/4							1		1		1			
	1/4 - 1/2			1						1			1		
	1/4 or less					5		1		6				6	
	Unknown		1	1						2					2
Subtotals		1	1	5	1	5	0	4	0	17					
C. 20-29 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full			4	1			1		9	9				
	1/2 - 3/4									0		0			
	1/4 - 1/2			2	1					3			3		
	1/4 or less			1						1				1	
	Unknown				1					1					1
Subtotals		3	0	7	3	0	0	1	0	14					
D. 30-39 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	3	1	4	2	1				11	11				
	1/2 - 3/4			1		1				2		2			
	1/4 - 1/2			4		2		1		7			7		
	1/4 or less									0				0	
	Unknown			2		1				3					3
Subtotals		3	1	11	2	5	0	1	0	23					
E. 40-49 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	7		5		1		3		16	16				
	1/2 - 3/4	1		2						3		3			
	1/4 - 1/2			1				1		2			2		
	1/4 or less			1						1				1	
	Unknown									0					0
Subtotals		8	0	9	0	1	0	4	0	22					
F. 50-59 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	4		7				1		12	12				
	1/2 - 3/4									0		0			
	1/4 - 1/2	1		1						2			2		
	1/4 or less									0				0	
	Unknown			1						1					1
Subtotals		5	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	15					
G. 60-69 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	1	1	4						6	6				
	1/2 - 3/4			1						1		1			
	1/4 - 1/2			1						1			1		
	1/4 or less									0				0	
	Unknown									0					0
Subtotals		1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	8					
H. 70-79 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	12		11				1		24	24				
	1/2 - 3/4	1		1						2		2			
	1/4 - 1/2			1				1		2			2		
	1/4 or less									0				0	
	Unknown	1								1					1
Subtotals		14	0	13	0	0	0	2	0	29					
I. 80-89 Tchrs.	3/4 - Full	9		4						13	13				
J. 90 or more	1/2 - 3/4	1		2						3		3			
	1/4 - 1/2			2				1		3			3		
	1/4 or less			1						1				1	
	Unknown			2						2					2
Subtotals		10	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	22					
Totals		45	3	71	6	11	0	14	0	150	98	12	21	9	10

Total Residential Supervisor-Respondents

Supervision Time: / Supervisor-types:	3/4-Full	1/2-3/4	1/4-1/2	1/4, Less	Unknown Time
s	40	3	1		1
s̲	2				1
sA	42	7	13	3	6
s̲A	4		1		1
sT	2	1	2	5	1
s̲T					
sAT	8	1	4	1	
s̲AT					

---

[1] Supervisor-types. s: supervisor of teachers of the deaf; s̲: supervisor of teachers of the deaf and others; A: administrator; T: teacher of the deaf. Combinations represent combinations of job-responsibilities.

[2] Supervision-time: time devoted to all activities related to the program for the deaf. 3/4-Full Time: 120 or more hours per month; 1/2-3/4 Time: 80-119 hrs./mo.; 1/4-1/2 Time: 40-79 hrs./mo.; 1/4 Time or Less: 39 or less hrs./mo.; Unknown Time: time amount not reported.

1/4 or less time supervisors occur in programs with fewer than 30 teachers. (3) There are no strong trends for the relatively small 1/2-3/4 time and 1/4-1/2 time categories of supervisors.

3. Combined Supervisor-type and supervision-time. Tables 9a and 9b classify supervisor-respondents by a combination of supervisor-type and supervision-time and also present distributions of these for various size-categories of Day and Residential programs.

a. Day programs. (1) The largest type-time group of respondents, nearly one-fifth (19%) of the total Day group, are Supervisor-administrators who work with other types of teachers (sA) and devote 1/4 time or less to work with teachers of the deaf. All but one of these are in smaller programs with 4 - 9 teachers of the deaf. (2) The second largest type-time group (10%) consists of Supervisors-only (s) who devote 3/4-full time to activities related to the program for the deaf. (3) The next four type-time groups in size are all Supervisor-administrators responsible only for teachers of the deaf (sA), who reported 1/2-3/4 time (7%), 3/4-full time (6%), 1/4-1/2 time (6%), or 1/4 time or less (6%).

b. Residential programs. (1) The largest type-time group of respondents (28%) consists of Supervisor-administrators (sA) who devote 3/4-full time to supervision of teachers of the deaf. They tend to be found in programs of all sizes. (2) The second-largest group (27%) consists of Supervisors-only who spend 3/4-full time on supervisory activities. These persons constitute significant proportions of the supervisory staffs in programs with 40 or more teachers. (3) The third largest group (9%) consists of Supervisor-administrators (sA) who devote 1/4-1/2 time to work with teachers of the deaf. They are found in programs of all sizes. (4) The three above-mentioned groups account for nearly two-thirds (64%) of the total 150 Residential respondents.

4. Programs with one supervisor.

a. Day programs. Over half (71 or 56%) of the 127 contacted Day programs reported one supervisory person. Fifty-six of these programs were represented in the study. Within the 36 smaller programs (4 - 9 teachers), 31% have one 3/4-full time person and 47% have one 1/4 or less time person. Within the 10 - 19 teacher category there are 10 one-supervisor programs, 70% of which have one 3/4-full time person. For the 8 larger programs (20 or more teachers), only 25% have one 3/4-full time supervisor and 25% have 1/4 or less time persons.

b. Residential programs. (1) About one-fifth (16 or 21%) of the contacted Residential programs reported one supervisor. None of these are programs with 40 or more teachers. Of the 13 one-supervisor programs represented in the study, 7 or 54% have 3/4-full time supervisors and 3 have persons who devote less than half time to work with teachers of the deaf.

C. EXTENT OF SUPERVISION: TOTAL SUPERVISION-TIME WITHIN SINGLE PROGRAMS

1. Procedures for quantifying supervision-time. It would be informative to be able to state the "extent" or "amount" of supervision being done in programs of various sizes. This is relatively easy for one-supervisor programs in which the single supervisor has responded to the questionnaire. However, this is more difficult for multiple-supervisor programs (1) because of the many possible supervision-time combinations when two, three, four or more supervisors are involved and (2) because many multiple-supervisor programs are not fully-represented in the study.

a. Type of representation. Programs were classified on the following bases:

Fully-represented programs: one-supervisor programs for which the supervisor is represented in the study and has reported supervision-time; multiple-supervision programs for which all supervisors are represented in the study and have reported supervision times.

Nearly-represented programs: multiple-supervisor programs for which all reported supervisors but one or two are represented in the study and have reported supervision times (for programs with 3 to 5 supervisors: all but one; for programs with 6 or more: all but one or two)

Insufficiently-represented programs: multiple-supervisor programs which are represented in the study but which do not fulfill the criteria given above.

Unrepresented programs: programs which reported no supervisors; programs which reported one or more supervisors but for which none are represented in the study or none have reported supervision times.

Table 10 shows the number of programs in combined size-categories that are represented to various degrees in the study. Thus, out of 191 total programs for which administrators returned responses, nearly half (46%) are fully-represented in the study (35% are one-supervisor programs; 11% are multiple-supervisor programs). Within the total 115 Day programs, 58% are fully-represented (the majority being one-supervisor programs) as are 30% of the total 76 Residential programs. In addition, 17% of the total 191 programs are nearly-represented (8% of the Day programs, 32% of the Residential).

b. Time amounts. In order to express the amount of supervision being done in a program, each time-category was assigned a numerical value. 3/4-full time was equated to 1.00 time, 1/2-3/4 time to .75 time, 1/4-1/2 time to .50 time, and 1/4 time or less to .25 time. Using these values, one can express the extent of supervision in one-supervisor programs and in multiple-supervisor programs without referring to the actual number of supervisory personnel. For example, in a four-supervisor program with one 3/4-full time person (1.00), two 1/2-3/4 time persons (2 x .75 or 1.50), and one 1/4 or less time person (.25), the total amount of supervision would be 2.75 time. And this value would be equivalent to a three-supervisor program with two 3/4-full time persons and one 1/2-3/4 time person or to a five-supervisor program with three 1/2-3/4 time persons and two 1/4 or less time persons. It must be noted, however, that since these values are based on the upper limits of time-categories (e.g., the 3/4 element of 1/2-3/4 time), they will tend to over-estimate the actual times reported for supervisory activities.

2. Supervision-time values. Using these notions of "degrees of representation" (proportion of reported supervisors within a program who are represented in the study) and supervision "time values" (total amount of supervision time being sepnt within a system, regardless of the number of supervisors), Table 11 presents the distribution of fully-represented and nearly-represented programs for time values ranging from .25 to 6.00. Altogether, 122 or nearly two-thirds (64%) of the total 191 reporting programs are included in this table (89 or 46% are fully-represented -- the majority being one-supervisor Day programs; 33 or 17% are nearly-represented -- the majority being multiple-supervisor Residential programs).

Table 10. Representation in the study of various program types and sizes

Degree of Representation		Day Programs								Residential Programs										Total Programs	
		4-9 Teachers		10-19 Teachers		20 or more Teachers		Subtotal		4-19 Teachers		20-39 Teachers		40-59 Teachers		60 or more Teachers		Subtotal			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
		(No. and % of programs):																			
Fully-represented	One-superv. Programs	38	51%	10	42%	8	47%	56	49%	5	29%	6	22%	0	0%	0	0%	11	14%	67	35%
	Multi-superv. Programs	6	8%	3	13%	1	6%	10	9%	1	6%	6	22%	3	23%	2	11%	12	16%	22	11%
Nearly-represented[1]		4	5%	3	13%	2	12%	9	8%	4	24%	4	15%	9	69%	7	37%	24	32%	33	17%
Insufficiently-represented		4	5%	2	8%	2	12%	8	7%	3	18%	3	11%	1	8%	8	42%	15	20%	23	12%
Unrepresented		22	30%	6	25%	4	24%	32	28%	4	24%	8	30%	0	0%	2	11%	14	18%	46	24%
Totals[2]		74		24		17		115		17		27		13		19		76		191	

[1] "Nearly-represented" is a relative term. For programs with 3 to 5 reported supervisors, a program is considered nearly-represented if "all but one" of its supervisors returned a usable questionnaire and reported supervision time. For programs with 6 or more supervisors, the figure is "all but one or two".

[2] Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

In interpreting the table, it is important to keep in mind (a) that the figures in the table represent only two-thirds of the total programs for the deaf; (b) that the time values tend to be overestimations; (c) that "supervision-time" is not equivalent to "visiting time"; and (d) that for a fully-represented program one may say, for example, that "2.00 time is spent in supervision" while for nearly-represented programs this must be revised to "_at least_ 2.00 time", since not all supervisors are represented.

a. _Supervision-time values for Day programs_. Of the total 75 fully-represented and nearly-represented Day programs, 42 (56%) have supervision time values of less than 1.00. Twenty-one (28%) programs have the equivalent of a person spending 1/4 time or less (.25) on supervision; 9 (12%) have values of .50; and 12 (16%) have values of .75. Twenty-two (29%) programs have the equivalent of a full time supervisor (1.00); 5 (7%) have values of 1.25 to 1.75; and 2 (3%) have values of 2.00 or more. The maximum time value for any Day program is 2.25.

There is apparently some relation between program size and amount of supervision. For the time values of .25, .50, and .75 (the equivalent of a person devoting 3/4 time or less to supervision), the percentages within the three size-categories are: 4 - 9 teachers, 69%; 10 - 19 teachers, 19%; 20 or more teachers, 55%. For the values 1.00 or more the figures are: 4 - 9 teachers, 31%; 10 - 19 teachers, 81%; 20 or more teachers, 45%. From these figures and those in the table it is evident that the majority of programs with fewer than 10 teachers have the equivalent of less than full-time supervisors, and that this is true for about a third of the programs with 10 - 19 teachers and approximately half of the programs with 20 or more teachers.

b. _Supervision time values for Residential programs_. The typically large sizes of Residential programs are reflected in their high supervision-time values. Combining fully-represented and nearly-represented programs, _Table 11_ reveals that of the total 47 programs, only 17% have time values of less than 1.00 to 1.75; 19% have values of 2.00 to 2.75; 13% have values of 2.00 to 2.75; 13% have values of 3.00 to 3.75; and 17% have values of 4.00 or more, the highest value being 6.00. Furthermore, the table graphically illustrates the strong

Table 11. Amounts of supervision in fully-represented and nearly-represented programs
Note: nearly-represented program numbers are in parentheses

	Day Programs				Residential Programs					
Time Values	4-9 Teachers	10-19 Teachers	20 or more Teachers	Subtotal	4-19 Teacher	20-39 Teachers	40-59 Teachers	60 or more Teachers	Subtotal	Total Programs
	Number of programs:									
.25	17 (3)	1		18 (3)	1 (1)	1			2 (1)	20 (4)
.50	5		4	9	(2)	2			2 (2)	11 (2)
.75	7 (2)	2	2	11 (1)			(1)		(1)	11 (2)
1.00	11	8 (1)	2	21 (1)	4 (1)	3 (2)		(1)	7 (4)	28 (5)
1.25	3	1		4			(1)		(1)	4 (1)
1.50		(2)	(1)	(3)		3	(1)		3 (1)	3 (4)
1.75	1	1		2						2
2.00			(1)	(1)	1	2 (1)	1 (1)		4 (2)	4 (3)
2.25			1	1			(1)		(1)	1 (1)
2.50						(1)			(1)	(1)
2.75							(1)		(1)	(1)
3.00						1	1	(1)	2 (1)	2 (1)
3.25								1	1	1
3.50							1 (1)		1 (1)	1 (1)
3.75										
4.00							(1)	(1)	(2)	(2)
4.25										
4.50								(1)	(1)	(1)
4.75										
5.00							(1)		(1)	(1)
5.25								(1)	(1)	(1)
5.50										
5.75								(1)	(1)	(1)
6.00								1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)
Totals:										
Fully-represented	44	13	9	66	6	12	3	2	23	89
Nearly-represented	(4)	(3)	(2)	(9)	(4)	(4)	(9)	(7)	(24)	(33)

relation between Residential program size and amount of supervision time. For the 10 programs with 4 to 19 teachers, the majority have time values of 1.00 or more, with one program having 2.00. For the 16 programs with 20 to 39 teachers, half have time values of 1.50 or more, with 5 having values of 2.00 or more. Of the 12 programs with 40 to 59 teachers, half have time values of 2.75 or more, with two having 4.00 or more. Of the 9 programs with 60 or more teachers, the majority have values of 4.50 or more, with two having values of 6.00.

c. Adequacy of supervision. For a rough estimate of the adequacy of supervision (in terms of time devoted to supervision) in programs for the deaf, one might set some arbitrary time value criteria for programs of various sizes and then determine how many programs fall above or below the criterion levels. In Table 12 this has been done for programs with no reported supervisors and for fully-represented programs -- the only two kinds of programs about which definite statements can be made. All other programs are only partially represented by supervisor returns in the study and are listed as "Other Programs". The criterion time-values chosen represent what are considered minimal teacher-(full-time) supervisor ratios of approximately 12:1. It may be noted that the Day programs are generally well-represented in this chart, since it took only one or two returned questionnaires to render most of these programs "fully-represented". The majority of Residential programs, which typically have two, three, or more supervisors per program, fall under the category "Other Programs" -- those for which one or more supervisors did not return questionnaires.

The table may be interpreted as follows. Using the Day size-category "10 - 14 teachers" as an example, one may say that "assuming that one full time supervisor (1.00) is a minimum criterion of supervision adequacy for programs of this size, it appears, from supervisor reports of time devoted to supervision that 6 (40%) of the 15 programs fall below this criterion and that 5 (33%) fall at or above this criterion." The remaining 4 (27%) programs are "unknowns" in terms of supervision adequacy. It must be emphasized that the criterion supervision time values, while based upon an approximate teacher-(full-time)supervisor ratio of 12:1, are nonetheless arbitrary to a certain extent. The setting of slightly different criterion values may have resulted in different figures and percentages.

Table 12. Comparison of program time-values to criterion time-values which represent a teacher-(full-time) supervisor ratio of approximately 12:1

	Fully-represented Programs and Programs Reporting No Supervisors					Other Programs[1]		No. of Programs[2]
	Criterion Supervision Time-Value	Programs Below Criterion Value No.	%[3]	Programs At Or Above Criterion No.	%[3]	No.	%[3]	
ay Programs								
-6 teachers	.25	8	16%	22	44%	20	40%	50
-9 teachers	.50	10	31%	13	41%	9	28%	32
0-14 teachers	1.00	6	40%	5	33%	4	27%	15
5-19 teachers	1.50	5	45%	0	0%	6	55%	11
0-29 teachers	1.75	8	73%	0	0%	3	27%	11
0 or more tchrs.	2.50	2	25%	0	0%	6	75%	8
otals		39	31%	40	31%	48	38%	127
esidential Programs								
4-9 teachers	.25	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	5
10-19 teachers	1.00	0	0%	5	38%	8	62%	13
20-29 teachers	2.00	7	50%	1	7%	6	43%	14
30-39 teachers	2.50	4	31%	1	7%	8	62%	13
40-49 teachers	3.25[4]	2	22%	0	0%	7	78%	9
50-59 teachers	4.00[4]	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4
60-69 teachers	5.00[4]	1	17%	0	0%	5	83%	6
70-79 teachers	6.00[4]	0	0%	1	13%	6	85%	7
80 or more tchrs.	7.00[4]	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	7
Totals		17	22%	9	12%	52	66%	78

[1] Partially-represented programs (one or more supervisors not responding) and non-represented programs (no supervisor responses)
[2] All programs with 4 or more teachers of the deaf in the United States
[3] Percentages of total number of programs within that size category
[4] Most of the Residential programs in these size-categories are partially- or insufficiently-represented by supervisor responses to the questionnaire

There are large fluctuations in the percentages of "adequately supervised" and "inadequately supervised" programs for the various size-categories. However, using the criterion values given and the sole factor of "time devoted to supervision", it would appear that for the Day programs about one-third are inadequately supervised, one-third are adequately-supervised, and another third are "unknown". For the Residential programs, 22% are inadequately-supervised, 12% are adequately-supervised, and the majority (66%) are, for purposes of this investigation, "unknown".

V. THE NATURE OF SUPERVISORY POSITIONS

This chapter is concerned with factors which describe the positions held by supervisors of teachers of the deaf. These factors include such things as supervisory loads and time devoted to supervision, types of teachers supervised, other positions held, salaries and time bases of the positions, and specific supervisory responsibilities. The information in this chapter is drawn from sections 1., 2.16 to 2.20, and 4. of the questionnaire.

A. CONTROL VARIABLES: SUPERVISOR-TYPES

1. Selection of control variables. A major problem involved selecting the most meaningful control variables to be used in presenting the data. A simple frequency distribution of all 258 supervisors would have provided little specific information, while a complete analysis by supervisor type, supervision time, and size of program would have resulted in very small groups and an intractable mass of data. A middle course was chosen as is explained below.

Dividing the total N of 258 into two large groups, Day and Residential, seemed a legitimate primary categorization for reasons discussed earlier. A second factor -- one that combined the most usefulness with the greatest applicability to all supervisors in both Day and Residential programs -- was that based on "type of supervisor" as defined in terms of job responsibilities. The symbols and terms -- S (Supervisor-only), SA (Supervisor-administrator), and S(A)T (Supervisor-teacher) -- were explained in a previous chapter. The distribution of these subgroups among Day and Resiential respondents, as shown in Table 13, reveals that at least half of the respondents in both types

Table 13. Distribution of supervisor-types in Day and Residential programs

	Day Programs			Residential Programs			Total Programs	
	N	% of Total Day N108	% of Total N258	N	% of Total Res.N150	% of Total N258	N	% of Total N258
Subgroup S	25	23.1	9.7	48	32.0	18.6	73	28.3
Subgroup SA	60	55.6	23.3	77	51.3	29.8	137	53.1
Subgroup S(A)T	23	21.3	8.9	25	16.7	9.7	48	18.6
Totals	108	100.0	41.9	150	100.0	58.1	258	100.0

of programs are Supervisor-administrators (SA's), with smaller numbers belonging to the other two subgroupings. The table also shows that approximately three-fifths of the respondents in the study represent Residential programs.

2. Profiles of Day and Residential supervisor-types. Since the six supervisor-type subgroups are used repeatedly throughout the study, this section presents a brief "profile" for each in order to acquaint the reader with distinctive subgroup characteristics which have direct bearings on topics to be discussed later. Most of the information for these profiles is drawn from subsequent sections.

Certain similarities and differences are apparent from the profiles. For instance, within the sample of Day respondents, Supervisors-only (S) are found in programs of all sizes, while a majority of SA's and S(A)T's come from small Day programs. S's are, first and foremost, supervisory personnel. They tend to devote at least half of their time to supervising teachers of the deaf, even though they are often responsible for other types of teachers and though they frequently have help from other supervisors of the deaf. Day SA and S(A)T subgroups seem to represent two approaches which smaller programs have taken to the need for supervision. The SA's are primarily administrators. They generally spend less than half time on supervision of the deaf, and about half of them are also responsible for other types of teachers; the majority report that there are other supervisors who assist in working with teachers of the deaf in their programs. Day S(A)T's, on the other hand, appear to be primarily teachers of the deaf (74% teach half time or more), although some also hold administrative posts. A majority are the sole supervisors in their programs, working mainly with teachers of the deaf and devoting a good share of their time to supervisory activities.

The picture is quite different in the sample of Residential supervisors. As might be expected, almost all work exclusively with teachers of the deaf, and most come from programs with two or more supervisors. However, S's, who devote the major share of their time to supervision, tend to come from the larger Residential programs. SA's, found in programs of all sizes, spend much of their time supervising in addition to administrative responsibilities. It is difficult to determine from the data whether they are primarily supervisors or primarily administrators (as is the case with Day SA's). S(A)T's, who tend to come from smaller programs, appear to divide their time between supervision, (administration), and teaching.

Profiles of Day and Residential Supervisor-types

	Sizes of Programs in which Employed	Proportion of Time Devoted To Supervision Activities Related to Programs for the Deaf (3/4-Full T.; 1/2-3/4 T.; 1/4-1/2 T.; 1/4 T. or Less	Types of Teachers Supervised (Teachers of Deaf/Non-Deaf Children)	Existence of Other Supervisors for Teachers of the Deaf in the Program
Day S (Supervisors-only) N25	Fairly equally distributed in programs of all sizes	Majority (60%) 3/4-full time; 12% 1/2-3/4 time; 12% 1/4-1/2 time; 16% 1/4 time or less	About half also work with teachers of non-deaf children	44% report being the sole supervisors in their programs
Day SA (Supervisor-administrators) N60	Majority (58%) from small programs; 25% in programs with 10-29 teachers; 17% in programs with 30 or more teachers	Large proportion (43% 1/4 time or less; 15% 3/4-full time; 20% 1/2-3/4 time; 17% 1/4-1/2 time	About half also work with teachers of non-deaf children	35% report being the sole supervisors in their programs
Day S(A)T (Supervisor-teachers) N23	Large majority (78%) from small programs (4-9 teachers); 9% in programs with 10-19 teachers; 13% in programs with 20 or more teachers	Large proportion (39%) 3/4-full time; 17% 1/2-3/4 time; 22% 1/4-1/2 time; 22% 1/4 time or less	22% also work with teachers of non-deaf children	70% report being the sole supervisor in their programs
Residential S (Supervisors-only) N48	Over half (54%) from large programs (60 or more teachers); 42% in programs with 20-59 teachers; 19% in programs with 4-19 teachers	Most (88%) 3/4-full time; 6% 1/2-3/4 time; 2% 1/4-1/2 time; None report 1/4 time or less	94% work only with teachers of the deaf	90% report other supervisors in their programs
Residential SA (Supervisor-administrators) N77	39% from large programs (60 or more teachers); Over half (53%) in moderate-size programs (20-59 teachers); 8% in programs with 4-19 teachers	Majority (60%) 3/4-full time; 9% 1/2-3/4 time 18% 1/4-1/2 time; 4% 1/4 time or less	92% work only with teachers of the deaf	83% report other supervisors in their programs
Residential S(A)T (Supervisor-teachers) N25	Only 12% from large programs; over half (52%) in moderate-size programs (20-59 teachers); 36% in programs with 4-19 teachers	Large proportion (40%) 3/4-full time 9% 1/2-3/4 time; 24% 1/4-1/2 time; 24% 1/4 time or less	100% work only with teachers of the deaf	84% report other supervisors in their programs

It is evident that there is no homogeneous group of "supervisors of teachers of the deaf." And in reading and interpreting the data and discussions to follow, it is important to keep in mind not only the basic differences between Day and Residential supervisors but also the finer distinctions between S, SA, and S(A)T subgroups within the two major categories.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF SUPERVISORY POSITIONS

1. Supervisory loads (Table 14). Supervisory loads, in terms of number of academic teachers of the deaf supervised (questionnaire item 1.7), vary according to types of supervisors. In Day programs, Supervisors-only (S) have the heaviest loads, with 56% responsible for supervising 10 or more teachers. This is undoubtedly related to previous findings that these supervisors tend to come from larger Day programs and that they devote large portions of their time to supervisory activities. Day Supervisor-administrators (SA) have somewhat lighter supervisory loads -- 40% are responsible for 10 or more teachers. The third group, S(A)T's, are generally employed in very small programs, and their supervisory loads are correspondingly small -- 13% supervise 10 or more teachers, and 26% supervise only one to four teachers. Taken as a group, the median supervisory load of all Day supervisors is 5 to 9 teachers.

The median supervisory load of Residential supervisors is 10 to 14 teachers. Residential S's cluster around supervisory loads of 10 to 19 teachers -- 66% fall within this category -- while only 10% reported responsibility for 1 to 9 teachers, and 15% are responsible for 20 or more teachers. Residential S(A)T's tend to have much lighter supervisory loads -- 52% are in the 1 to 9 teacher category and an additional 38% are in the 10 to 14 category, probably reflecting their additional teaching (and administrative) responsibilities or the fact that many are located in smaller programs.

In interpreting the figures in Table 14, the possibility of "overlap" in reporting teacher loads should be mentioned. That is, two or more individuals within a single system may have supervisory responsibility for some of the same teachers. This is brought out particularly by instances such as those Day and Residential S's who reported loads of 30 or more teachers, two Day SA's with loads of 50 or more, and 14 Residential SA's with loads of 30 or more. It is possible that some of these are solely responsible for large number of teachers. However, it is more likely, particularly in the case of Supervisor-administrators, that these persons have a kind of "generalized responsibility"

Table 14. Number of academic teachers of the deaf supervised by individual supervisors

Number of Teachers Supervised	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
1 - 4	3	12.0	11	18.3	6	26.1	20	18.5
5 - 9	8	32.0	24	40.0	13	56.5	45	41.7
10 - 14	4	16.0	8	13.3	2	8.7	14	13.0
15 - 19	7	28.0	7	11.7	0	0.0	14	13.0
20 - 24	2	8.0	4	6.7	0	0.0	6	5.6
25 - 29	0	0.0	3	5.0	1	4.3	4	3.7
30 - 34) 35 - 39)	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
40 - 44) 45 - 49)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
50 or more	0	0.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	2	1.9
No Response	0	0.0	1	1.7	1	4.3	2	1.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
1 - 4	1	2.1	1	1.3	7	28.0	9	6.0
5 - 9	4	8.3	7	9.1	6	24.0	17	11.3
10 - 14	21	43.8	18	23.4	7	28.0	46	30.7
15 - 19	11	22.9	16	20.8	2	8.0	29	19.3
20 - 24	4	8.3	7	9.1	0	0.0	11	7.3
25 - 29	1	2.1	6	7.8	0	0.0	7	4.7
30 - 34) 35 - 39)	0	0.0	6	7.8	0	0.0	6	4.0
40 - 44) 45 - 49)	1	2.1	2	2.6	0	0.0	3	2.0
50 or more	1	2.1	6	7.8	0	0.0	7	4.7
No Response	4	8.3	8	10.4	3	12.0	15	10.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

for large numbers of teachers but that other individuals within their programs are involved in more "direct supervision" (i.e., classroom visits and conferences with the teachers). This "responsibility overlap" and the probability of different kinds of supervisory responsibilities should be kept in mind in interpreting other data in the report.

2. Amount of time devoted to supervision. Table 15 shows the approximate number of hours per month that supervisors reported spending in all types of supervisory activities related to programs for the deaf (questionnaire item 2.1). Day respondents as a group tend to polarize on this factor, 31% spending 3/4 full time and 32% spending 1/4 time or less on supervisory activities. Smaller percentages report 1/2 3/4 time (18%) and 1/4 1/2 time (17%). Major differences can also be noted between the three Day supervisor-types.

Table 15. Approximate number of hours per month devoted to supervisory activities related to education of the deaf

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
120 or more hrs./mo. (3/4 - full time)	15	60.0	9	15.0	9	39.1	33	30.6
80 to 119 hrs./mo. (1/2 - 3/4 time)	3	12.0	12	20.0	4	17.4	19	17.6
40 to 79 hrs./mo. (1/4 - 1/2 time)	3	12.0	10	16.7	5	21.7	18	16.7
0 to 39 hrs./mo. (1/4 time or less)	4	16.0	26	43.3	5	21.7	35	32.4
No Response	0	0.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	3	2.8
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
120 or more hrs./mo. (3/4 - full time)	42	87.5	46	59.7	10	40.0	98	65.3
80 to 119 hrs./mo. (1/2 - 3/4 time)	3	6.3	7	9.1	2	8.0	12	8.0
40 to 79 hrs./mo. (1/4 - 1/2 time)	1	2.1	14	18.2	6	24.0	21	14.0
0 to 39 hrs./mo. (1/4 time or less)	0	0.0	3	3.9	6	24.0	9	6.0
No Response	2	4.2	7	9.1	1	4.0	10	6.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

In the Residential group almost two-thirds (65%) report spending 3/4 full time on supervisory activities, with smaller proportions reporting 1/2 - 3/4 time (8%), 1/4 - 1/2 time (14%), and 1/4 time or less (6%).

In comparing Day and Residential supervisor-types, it appears that in both types of programs Supervisors-only devote the most hours per month to supervisory activities. This might be expected, since these persons by definition have supervision as their major responsibility. The proportionately fewer Day S's (60%) than Residential S's (88%) who report 3/4 - full time for supervision of the program for the deaf may reflect the fact that Day S's typically have additional responsibility for other types of teachers. The figures for both Day and Residential S(A)T's are quite similar, with roughly 40% reporting 3/4 - full time and smaller percentages falling into the other time categories. The most notable differences occur between Day SA's (3/4 - full time, 15%; 1/4 time or less, 43%) and Residential SA's (3/4 - full time, 60%; 1/4 time or less, 4%).

3. Supervision time ratios. Supervisory teacher-loads and supervision-times, as just reported, provide interesting descriptive data on "amounts" of supervision being done. But neither of these factors taken alone presents a true indication of "supervisory activity". In order to get a better picture of this activity and to facilitate comparison between Day and Residential supervisors, a factor was devised which combines information on both of these variables. This factor, called the "supervision-time ratio", was computed for each individual supervisor, taking the actual (ungrouped) number of hours per month devoted to supervisory activities related to the program for the deaf and dividing this by the actual (ungrouped) number of academic teachers of the deaf for whom the supervisor is responsible. The resulting figures range from 0.1 to over 14.0 and may be read as "_._ hours per month per teacher devoted to supervisory activities". Since "supervisory activities" is a rather loose term which was left to the interpretation of the respondents, the supervision-time ratio should not be interpreted as a precise figure showing amount of time spent with each teacher, but simply as a figure that relates the amount of time a respondent devotes to supervision to the size of his supervisory load. These ratios have been grouped and are shown in Table 16.

In the previous section it was shown that Day S's devote more actual time to supervisory activities than do Day S(A)T's or SA's. However, when supervisory load is taken into account by using supervision-time ratios, it is seen

Table 16. Supervision-time ratios: number of hours per month spent for each teacher by Day and Residential supervisors of various types

Supervision Time Per Teacher in Hrs./Mo.	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
0.1 to 3.9	3	12.0	22	36.6	3	13.0	28	25.9
4.0 to 7.9	6	24.0	18	30.0	4	17.4	28	25.9
8.0 to 11.9	6	24.0	6	10.0	3	13.0	15	13.9
12.0 or more	10	40.0	10	16.7	12	52.2	32	29.7
No Response	0	0.0	4	6.7	1	4.3	5	4.6
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
0.1 to 3.9	2	4.2	13	16.9	6	24.0	21	14.0
4.0 to 7.9	8	16.7	22	28.6	5	20.0	35	23.3
8.0 to 11.9	13	27.1	12	15.6	0	0.0	25	16.7
12.0 or more	20	41.7	15	19.5	12	48.0	47	31.3
No Response	5	10.4	15	19.5	2	8.0	22	14.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

that proportionately more S(A)T's (52%) than S's (40%) spend 12 or more hours per month per teacher, although the size of this difference is neutralized somewhat by the figures for the 8.0 to 11.9 hours per month category (Day S(A)T's: 13%; Day S's: 24%). The Day SA group tends to have much lower ratios than the other two groups, with only 17% receiving ratios of 12.0 or more, 10% receiving 8.0 to 11.9, 30% receiving 4.0 to 7.9, and 37% receiving ratios of 0.1 to 3.9. For the Day supervisors as a whole, there is a fairly equalized distribution over the ratio categories. The largest group (30%) has ratios of 12.0 or more, 14% have ratios of 8.0 to 11.9, 26% have 4.0 to 7.9, and 26% have 0.1 to 3.9. Five percent are listed as "No Response" because their ratios could not be computed due to omission of either the numerator or the denominator figures in their questionnaire responses.

Among Residential respondents, the S(A)T's also have the largest percentage with ratios of 12.0 or more (48%), but this is somewhat misleading since the remainder of this group cluster into the two lowest ratios: none have ratios of 8.0 to 11.9, 20% have 4.0 to 7.9, and 24% have 0.1 to 3.9. In contrast, the Residential S subgroup has 42% of its members in the 12.0 or more category, but the remainder show a more steady downward trend: 27% have ratios of 8.0 to 11.9, 17% have 4.0 to 7.9, and only 4% have ratios of 0.1 to 3.9. As a group, the Supervisors-only (S) tend to spend the most supervisory time per teacher of the three subgroups. The SA's, who in Table 15 tended to report large amounts of time devoted to supervisory activities, make a less impressive showing when these time amounts are divided by supervisory loads. Twenty percent have ratios of 12.0 or more, 16% have 8.0 to 11.9, 29% have 4.0 to 7.9, and 17% have ratios of 0.1 to 3.9. This may be a reflection of these individuals' more "generalized" supervisory responsibilities, as mentioned previously, as well as the relatively large teacher loads that go along with these broader, less classroom-oriented responsibilities.

When both supervision time and supervisory loads are taken into account, as they are in the supervision-time ratios, the total Day and total Residential groups are remarkably similar. The percentages for the ratios 12.0 or more are 30% (D, Day) and 31% (R, Residential); for ratios 8.0 to 11.9: 14% (D), 17% (R); for ratios 4.0 to 7.9: 26% (D), 24% (R); for ratios 0.1 to 3.9: 26% (D), 14% (R). The No Response percentages were 5% for Day, 15% for Residential supervisors. For both groups, the S's and S(A)T's tend to have the higher supervision-time ratios, while SA's have lower ratios.

4. Ages of deaf children in classes for which supervisors are responsible. In an attempt to describe the types of classes supervised, respondents were asked to check various categories to indicate the age ranges of "...most of the deaf children in classes which you are responsible for supervising." The results, shown in Table 17, reveal certain patterns which are not unpredictable from the nature of the two major types of programs.

Day programs, which are typically much smaller than Residential programs, frequently have single supervisors who would of necessity work with the entire gamut of ages, and even two-supervisor Day programs would require the supervisors to cover wide age-ranges. As another pattern, it may be noted that nearly two-thirds of the Day supervisors work with classes of children below 3 years of age, reflecting Day program emphasis on early childhood education. Over 85% of the respondents supervise classes with children of 4 to 11 years of age, and the percentages steadily decline as ages increase: 81% for ages 12, 13, 14; 57% for ages 15, 16, 17; and 36% for ages 18 or older.

Table 17. Respondents supervising at various age levels

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
0 - 3 years old	15	60.0	39	65.0	13	56.5	67	62.0
4, 5 years old	24	96.0	50	83.3	19	82.6	93	86.1
6, 7, 8 years old	24	96.0	56	93.3	21	91.3	101	93.5
9, 10, 11 years old	23	92.0	51	85.0	20	87.0	94	87.0
12, 13, 14 years old	21	84.0	48	80.0	18	78.3	87	80.6
15, 16, 17 years old	16	64.0	34	56.7	12	52.2	62	57.4
18 or older	10	40.0	21	35.0	8	34.8	39	36.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
0 - 3 years old	7	14.6	22	28.6	3	12.0	32	21.3
4, 5 years old	20	41.7	38	49.4	8	32.0	66	44.0
6, 7, 8 years old	32	66.7	49	63.6	12	48.0	93	62.0
9, 10, 11 years old	34	70.8	60	77.9	15	60.0	109	72.7
12, 13, 14 years old	34	70.8	64	83.1	18	72.0	116	77.3
15, 16, 17 years old	22	45.8	59	76.6	15	60.0	96	64.0
18 or older	26	54.2	18	23.4	10	40.0	54	36.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*There is more than one answer per respondent

The percentages are more difficult to interpret for Residential respondents, since in practice many supervisors in these large programs are responsible for specific age or grade levels. Thus, none of the age categories was checked by more than 80% of the respondents as two categories were for the Day supervisors. The age ranges that drew the most responses were 12, 13, 14 (77%) and 9, 10, 11 (73%). The later age of school entrance for Residential programs is reflected in the relatively small percentages of respondents who checked ages 0 - 3 (21%) and 4, 5 (44%), as compared with corresponding Day supervisors' percentages of 62% and 86%. For older ages, the percentages for Day and Residential supervisors are similar (D 57%; R 64%), and for ages 18 or older they are identical -- 36%, a figure that may reflect the academic attrition rate of older deaf children.

5. Types of teachers supervised. In the previous chapter, figures were presented for supervisors who worked only with teachers of the deaf and also for those who also supervised other types of teachers. In Table 18 this information

Table 18. Types of teachers supervised

Types of teachers supervised	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Deaf only	12	48.0	28	46.7	18	78.3	58	53.7
Deaf and non-deaf handicapped	12	48.0	19	31.7	4	17.4	35	32.4
Deaf and non-handicapped	0	0.0	9	15.0	0	0.0	9	8.3
Deaf, non-deaf handicapped and non-handicapped	1	4.0	4	6.7	1	4.3	6	5.6
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Deaf only	45	93.7	71	92.2	25	100.0	141	94.0
Deaf and non-deaf handicapped	3	6.3	6	7.8	0	0.0	9	6.0
Deaf and non-handicapped	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Deaf, non-deaf handicapped and non-handicapped	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

is broken down into four types of supervisory loads: deaf only; deaf and non-deaf handicapped; deaf and non-handicapped; and deaf, non-deaf handicapped, and non-handicapped.

Of the total Day respondents, 54% work only with teachers of deaf, 32% with teachers of the deaf and of the non-deaf handicapped, 8% with teachers of the deaf and of the non-handicapped, and 6% with all types of teachers. It may be interesting here to point out that of the non-deaf handicaps mentioned, the largest numbers of supervisors reported being responsible for teachers of speech handicapped (20 supervisors) and the orthopedically and physically handicapped (19). Other handicapped groups reported were the visually handicapped (16 supervisors), and mentally retarded (15), children with language and learning disorders (10), the hard of hearing (6), the emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted (5), and children with multiple handicaps (2). It is assumed that hearing handicapped children who also have one or more of these handicapping conditions are included in the "deaf" group, particularly since these other handicapped groups were specifically restricted to teachers of the "non-deaf" handicapped. However, one may speculate on possible reasons for the very small number of respondents who also supervise classes for hard of hearing children, particularly since most of these respondents have backgrounds and skills which should qualify them to supervise teachers and/or other personnel who work with the less severely hearing handicapped.

Residential supervisors of all three types work almost exclusively with teachers of deaf children. Three Residential S's and 6 SA's are the only respondents who reported working with teachers of the non-deaf handicapped, and none of the respondents supervise teachers of the non-handicapped. Among the handicaps mentioned in the preceding paragraph, each was checked by just one Residential supervisor, with the exception of language and learning disorders (7 supervisors), the multiply-handicapped (2), and the speech handicapped (none).

6. Administrative positions held by supervisors. In Table 7 it was shown that nearly two-thirds (63%) of the total respondents hold administrative positions in addition to their supervisory responsibilities, with 53% serving as Supervisor-administrators (SA) and 10% as Supervisor-administrator-teachers (SAT). These percentages for SA and SAT groups are quite similar for both Day and Residential samples.

When specific types of administrative positions held were investigated, (Table 19), Day and Residential response percentages were again quite similar, with the exception of one category. Thus, for both groups approximately half of the Supervisor-administrators (SA + SAT) reported that they were principals of either programs exclusively for the deaf or, in the case of many Day respondents, of schools for both deaf and other types of children. The major difference between Day and Residential respondents occurs in the category "director or coordinator of special education." Only 1% of the Residential respondents checked this position, whereas 24% of the Day respondents did so. This relates to the previous finding that a high percentage of Day supervisors work with a variety of teacher-types in the general area of "special education." The remaining positions were checked by relatively small numbers of Day and Residential respondents. For the post of vice-principal, the figures

Table 19. Administrative positions held by respondents who reported holding administrative posts in addition to supervisory positions (Supervisor-types SA and SAT)

Administrative Positions	Group S and ST	Group SA		Group SAT		Total SA & SAT		Total S,ST,SA,SAT	
	No.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents								
Head teacher	0	1	1.7	3	25.0	4	5.6	4	3.7
Vice principal	0	4	6.7	1	8.3	5	6.9	5	4.6
Principal	0	28	46.7	5	41.7	33	45.8	33	30.6
Dir. or coord. of special educ.	0	16	26.7	1	8.3	17	23.6	17	15.7
Ass't. Supt.	0	2	3.4	1	8.3	3	4.2	3	2.8
Superintendent	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other	0	13	21.7	1	8.3	14	19.4	14	13.0
No Response*	36	2	3.3	0	0.0	2	2.8	38	35.2
Totals**	36	60		12		72		108	
	Residential respondents								
Head teacher	0	5	6.5	4	28.6	9	9.9	9	6.0
Vice principal	0	10	13.0	1	7.1	11	12.1	11	7.3
Principal	0	43	55.8	4	28.6	47	51.6	47	31.3
Dir. or coord. of special educ.	0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	0.7
Ass't. Supt.	0	8	10.3	0	0.0	8	8.8	8	5.3
Superintendent	0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	0.7
Other	0	24	31.2	3	21.4	27	29.7	27	18.0
No Response*	59	1	1.3	2	14.3	3	13.3	62	41.3
Totals**	59	77		14		91		150	

*The No Response category is classified as "Appropriate No Response" for groups S and ST, since they hold no administrative positions

**There is more than one answer per respondent are D (Day) 7%, R (Residential) 12%; for head teacher, D 6%, R 10%; for assistant superintendent, D 4%, R 9%; and for superintendent, D 0%, R 1%.

Nineteen percent of the Day and 30% of the Residential respondents reported holding "other" positions (positions not listed in the questionnaire item), and many wrote in the titles of these positions. Some of the responses are listed below in the forms given by respondents.

Assistant to the principal
Associate superintendent
Clinical professor of secondary education
Coordinator of aural education
Coordinator of parents' activities
Coordinator of program for the hearing handicapped
Coordinator of rehabilitation center
Coordinator of teacher training
Curriculum development
Dean of boys
Department head
Director
Director of athletics
Director of audiology department
Director of education
Director of program for the deaf
Director of nursery school
Director of research and clinical services
Director of speech and hearing center
Educational consultant
Speech and hearing consultant
Supervisor of hard of hearing and sight conservation

In summary, it might be said that approximately half of the Supervisor-administrators are principals of one kind or another, that much smaller percentages are vice principals, head teachers, and assistant superintendents, and that approximately one-fourth of these persons hold various other administrative posts. In addition, about one-fourth of the Day supervisors are directors or coordinators of special education within their school systems.

In order to define administrative positions more precisely, SA and SAT respondents were asked to indicate which types of children they were responsible for as administrators. In Table 20 the first two categories, "all deaf children in the system" and "certain grades or ages of deaf children", were subdivided to provide separate responses for those who worked only with the deaf and for those who were also responsible for other types of children. Every SA or SAT respondent had to fit into one of these four categories, and they (along with the No Response Category) total 100%. The remaining categories represent other types of children for whom respondents may be responsible.

The strongest contrast between Day Supervisor-administrators and their Residential counterparts is revealed in the first four categories. While 32% of the Day respondents are administratively responsible only for deaf children, 77% of the Residential are. Conversely, 63% of the Day respondents are responsible administratively for children other than the deaf, while only

Table 20. Types of children for whom SA and SAT respondents are responsible as administrators

	Group SA		Group SAT		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents					
All deaf children in system (only this sub-item checked)	12	20.0	6	50.0	18	25.0
(this sub-item and others checked)	29	48.3	5	41.7	34	47.2
Certain grades or ages of deaf children (only this sub-item checked)	4	6.7	1	8.3	5	6.9
(this sub-item and other checked)	11	18.3	0	0.0	11	15.3
Hard of hearing children	32	53.3	5	41.7	37	51.4
Non-deaf handicapped children	22	36.7	2	16.7	24	33.3
Non-handicapped children	11	18.3	0	0.0	11	15.3
Other	9	15.0	1	8.3	10	13.9
No Response	4	6.7	0	0.0	4	5.6
Totals*	60		12		72	
	Residential respondents					
All deaf children in system (only this sub-item checked)	37	48.1	6	42.9	43	47.3
(this sub-item and others checked)	8	10.4	0	0.0	8	8.8
Certain grades or ages of deaf children (only this sub-item checked)	19	24.7	8	57.1	27	29.7
(this sub-item and others checked)	5	6.5	0	0.0	5	5.5
Hard of hearing children	9	11.6	0	0.0	9	9.9
Non-deaf handicapped children	5	6.5	0	0.0	5	5.5
Non-handicapped children	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other	5	6.5	0	0.0	5	5.5
No Response	8	10.4	0	0.0	8	8.8
Totals*	77		14		91	

*There is more than one answer per respondent

14% of the Residential respondents are. There is also a tendency for Residential respondents to have more responsibility for particular grade levels or age groups (35%) than there is for Day respondents (22%), although it must be remembered that these percentages are for administrative and not necessarily supervisory responsibility. It is possible that some Residential respondents actually supervise specific levels or grades but assume broader responsibilities administratively -- in fact this is quite obvious from some of the administrative titles and positions mentioned in the preceding section.

In non-deaf areas, 51% of the Day respondents report administrative responsibilities for hard of hearing children, 33% for the non-deaf handicapped, and 15% for the non-handicapped. The figures for Residential respondents are, respectively 10%, 6%, and 0%.

7. Classroom teaching done by supervisors. In addition to those respondents who have administrative responsibilities, some supervisors report doing classroom teaching with deaf children as part of their jobs. (Indeed, as appears to be the case with a number of Supervisor-(administrators)-teachers, teaching may actually be the respondent's primary responsibility, with supervision being a relatively minor part of the job.) According to Table 21, 11 (10%) of the Day respondents are classified as Supervisor-teachers (ST) and 12 (11%) are Supervisor-administrator-teachers (SAT). Of the Residential respondents, 11 (7%) are ST's and 14 (9%) are SAT's. Altogether, respondents who also teach constitute about one-fifth (19%) of the total 258 respondents.

The number of Supervisor-teachers (ST and SAT) is so small, that it would be rather presumptuous to consider patterns within these groups. Yet, as a matter of interest, the amounts of time devoted to classroom teaching are presented in Table 21. It may be noted that among the Day Supervisor-teachers, the amounts of teaching time are similar for ST's and SAT's, with nearly equal-size groups reporting full time, 1/2 time, and 1/4 time or less and a smaller group reporting 3/4 time. The pattern for Residential ST's and SAT's are quite different from each other and from those of the Day group. The largest group of ST's report teaching full time (55%) while 9% report 3/4 time, none report 1/2 time, and 36% report 1/4 time or less. The corresponding percentages for the SAT group are 14%, 7%, 7%, and 64%.

8. Administrators to whom supervisors are responsible. To further describe the nature of supervisory positions, questionnaire item 1.16 asked respondents "To whom are you directly responsible (your immediate superior)

Table 21. Time devoted to teaching deaf children by Supervisor-teachers (ST) and Supervisor-administrator-teachers (SAT)

	Group ST		Group SAT		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents					
Full time	3	27.3	4	33.3	7	30.4
3/4 time	2	18.2	1	8.3	3	13.0
1/2 time	3	27.3	3	25.0	6	26.1
1/4 time or less	3	27.3	4	33.3	7	30.4
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals*						
	Residential respondents					
Full time	6	54.5	2	14.3	8	32.0
3/4 time	1	9.1	1	7.1	2	8.0
1/2 time	0	0.0	1	7.1	1	4.0
1/4 time or less	4	36.4	9	64.3	13	52.0
No Response	0	0.0	1	7.1	1	4.0
Totals*	11		14		25	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

in your position as a supervisor?" This item was incidentally included to provide an indication of the status of supervisors in the hierarchial organization of school systems -- more so for the S's and ST's than for the SA's and SAT's, whose administrative positions have already been discussed.

Table 22 shows that the largest groups of Day supervisors are directly responsible to directors or coordinators of special education (22%), to assistant superintendents (21%), or to "other" types of administrators (19%), with all other categories containing 8% or less of the respondents. The "other" types of administrators in Day systems tended to be persons with a wide variety of titles but with positions that appeared similar in status to the category "director or coordinator of special education". Four percent reported no immediate superiors and 10% did not respond to this item. There are different patterns evident among the three types of Day supervisors. In subgroup S, 36% of the respondents reported directors or coordinators of special education as their immediate superiors, 16% reported assistant superintendents, and 16% listed "others". The SA's, who are administrators themselves, are most often responsible to assistant superintendents (27%), to "others" (25%), or to directors of special education (18%). Since the S(A)T subgroup contains some teachers and some administrator-teachers, their range of immediate superiors is broad, and no strong patterns are revealed.

Table 22. Administrative persons to whom respondents are directly responsible as supervisors of teachers of the deaf

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
Persons to whom responsible	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
No immediate supervisor	0	0.0	1	1.7	3	13.0	4	3.7
Principal of classes for deaf and others	3	12.0	1	1.7	4	17.4	8	7.4
Principal of classes for deaf only	1	4.0	4	6.7	0	0.0	5	4.6
Director or Coord. of special education	9	36.0	11	18.3	4	17.4	24	22.2
Ass't. Superintendent	4	16.0	16	26.7	3	13.0	23	21.3
Superintendent	1	4.0	5	8.3	3	13.0	9	8.3
Board of directors	1	4.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	3	2.8
Others	4	16.0	15	26.0	2	8.7	21	19.4
No Response	2	8.0	5	8.3	4	17.4	11	10.4
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
No immediate supervisor	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.7
Principal of classes for deaf and others	5	10.4	5	6.5	5	20.0	15	10.0
Principal of classes for deaf only	16	33.3	6	7.8	8	32.0	30	20.0
Director or Coord. of special education	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ass't. Superintendent	17	35.4	15	19.5	1	4.0	33	22.0
Superintendent	5	10.4	37	48.1	2	8.0	44	29.3
Board of directors	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Others	1	2.1	9	11.7	8	32.0	18	12.0
No Response	4	8.3	4	5.2	1	4.0	9	6.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Among the total Residential supervisors, the largest groups are responsible to superintendents (29%), to assistant superintendents (22%), and to principals of classes of the deaf (20%). Smaller groups reported as their superiors "other" (12%) and principals of classes for the deaf and other types of classes (10%). Only one respondent reported no immediate superior, and none reported responsibility to a board of directors or a director or coordinator of special education (which is understandable, since this is a position found primarily in Day programs). Subgroup S respondents are generally responsible to assistant superintendents (35%) and to principals of classes for the deaf (33%). The higher positions of SA's on the administrative hierarchy are reflected in the 48% who reported superintendents as their immediate superiors. The largest groups of S(A)T's reported principals of classes for the deaf (32%) and "others" (32%) as their superiors.

As might be predicted, for both Day and Residential groups the SA respondents tend to be "higher" in the administrative hierarchy (responsible to persons with more general authority) than either the S or S(A)T groups, probably due to the fact that SA's already hold administrative posts in addition to their supervisory positions.

9. Time basis of position. Item 4.2 of the questionnaire inquired concerning the time basis of the respondent's supervisory position with answer blanks for 9 to 12 month periods. This item is straightforward enough for subgroups S and ST, since their positions are primarily supervisory in nature. However, complications arise in analyzing the responses of SA's and SAT's, who hold both supervisory and administrative positions. It cannot be determined on the basis of responses to item 4.2 how many of the SA's and SAT's were unable to separate supervisory from administrative responsibilities and compromised by reporting a time basis reflecting both positions and how many were able or chose to separate these two types of responsibility and reported only the supervisory time basis. In spite of these difficulties in interpreting the data, the supervisors' reported time bases for their positions are presented in Table 23.

Fairly similar patterns are revealed for both Day and Residential groups. The largest groups of supervisors are employed on a 10-month basis (Day 45%, Residential 45%), with groups of decreasing size working on a 12-month basis (D 32%, R 30%), a 9-month basis (D 12%, R 15%), and an 11-month basis (D 8%,

Table 23. Time basis of position as supervisor

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
12 month	5	20.0	28	46.7	2	8.7	35	32.4
11 month	3	12.0	4	6.7	2	8.7	9	8.3
10 month	13	52.0	25	41.7	11	47.8	49	45.4
9 month	3	12.0	2	3.3	8	34.8	13	12.0
Less than 9 month	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
No Response	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
Total*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
12 month	5	10.4	34	44.2	5	20.0	44	29.3
11 month	8	16.7	7	9.1	1	4.0	16	10.7
10 month	23	47.9	30	39.0	14	56.0	67	44.7
9 month	12	25.0	6	7.8	4	16.0	22	14.7
Less than 9 month	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	1	0.7
Total*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

R 11%). Within both Day and Residential groups, nearly equal proportions of SA's are employed on 10-month and 12-month bases, and the largest groups of S's and S(A)T's are employed on a 10-month basis.

10. Salary. Table 24 presents information on the gross salaries (before deductions) of respondents for the 1965-1966 school year.

Within the Day group, Supervisor-administrators (SA) have the highest salaries, with 17% reporting $9000 to $10,000 per year, 25% reporting $11,000 to $12,999, and 43% reporting $13,000 or more. Supervisors-only (S) have the next-highest salaries, with 68% reporting yearly salaries of $9000 or more, and Supervisor-administrator-teachers (S(A)T) are somewhat lower, with 43% in the $9000 or more category. In interpreting these figures it is important to keep in mind that higher salaries tend to be related to administrative positions, such as those held by SA's, many of whom are directors of special education. It may also be noted that the salaries seem to parallel the time bases of the positions which were just discussed in the preceding section. For example, 53% of the SA's are employed on 11- or 12- month bases, while

Table 24. 1965-1966 gross salary

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Below $3000	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
$3000 - 4999	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.7	2	1.9
$5000 - 6999	2	8.0	0	0.0	2	8.7	4	3.7
$7000 - 8999	5	20.0	5	8.3	9	39.1	19	17.6
$9000 - 10,999	9	36.0	10	16.7	7	30.4	26	24.1
$11,000 - 12,999	5	20.0	15	25.0	3	13.0	23	21.3
$13,000 or more	3	12.0	26	43.4	0	0.0	29	26.9
No Response	1	4.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	4	3.7
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Below $3000	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	1	0.7
$3000 - 4999	1	2.1	1	1.3	2	8.0	4	2.7
$5000 - 6999	6	12.5	7	9.1	3	12.0	16	10.7
$7000 - 8999	22	45.8	26	33.8	9	36.0	57	38.0
$9000 - 10,999	11	22.9	28	36.4	5	20.0	44	29.3
$11,000 - 12,999	7	14.6	9	11.7	2	8.0	18	12.0
$13,000 or more	0	0.0	5	6.5	0	0.0	5	3.3
No Response	1	2.1	1	1.3	3	12.0	5	3.3
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

only 32% of the S's and 17% of the S(A)T's are so employed. Thus, the monthly salaries for these three subgroups may not be as divergent as the yearly salaries would appear to indicate. Perhaps the most equitable types of intergroup comparisons would be done on the basis of monthly salary per month of employment, but figures for this type of comparison were not computed in this data analysis.

Within the Residential group, the SA group also has the highest yearly salaries. The largest proportion reported $7000 to 8,999 (34%) and $9000 to 10,999 (36%), with 18% reporting $11,000 a year or more. The S's follow, with 60% reporting yearly incomes of up to $8999 and 38% reporting $9000 or more. Of the S(A)T's, 60% reported incomes of up to $8999 and 28% reported $9000 or more. The points noted above for the Day subgroupings should be kept in mind in interpreting these results for the Residential subgroups.

Since the time bases for Day and Residential subgroups S, SA, and S(A)T are similar, there is some justification for making Day-Residential subgroup salary comparisons. It is immediately apparent that the salaries of the Day respondents tend to be higher. Among Day Supervisor-administrators, 25% have salaries from $7000 to 10,999 and 68% have salaries of $11,000 or more (with 43% earning $13,000 or more). Among Residential SA's, 70% reported $7000 to $10,999 and 18% reported $11,000 or more. Using somewhat different salary categories to compare other types of supervisors, 28% of the Day S's reported salaries of up to $8999 and 68% reported $9000 or more (12% reporting $13,000 or more). The corresponding figures for Residential S's are 60% and 38% (with none over $13,000). Among Day S(A)T's, 9% reported salaries of less than $5000, 48% reported $5000 to 8999, and 43% reported $9000 or more per year. The corresponding figures for Residential S(A)T's are 12%, 48%, and 28%.

In comparing total Day supervisors and total Residential supervisors, it is again evident that Day salaries are higher. The figures are as follows -- yearly salaries below $5000: Day 3%, Residential 3%; $5000 to 8999: D 21%, R 49%; $9000 to 12,999: D 45%, R 41%; $13,000 or more: D 27%, R 15%. There appear to be no substantial differences between the Day and Residential groups in time bases or in proportions of the three types of supervisors -- factors which could account for salary distribution differences. There may be other factors which account for these differences -- geographical distribution of programs, perhaps, or differences in years of experience between the two groups; but whatever the causative factors, the actual salary differentials are apparently quite real.

In addition to the factual information on salaries, it was desired to get some indication of how supervisors' salaries compared with teachers' salaries. Since this differential would be a very relative thing, depending upon the salary schedule of particular school systems as well as the number of years of experience of the teachers and supervisors, it was decided to let each of the supervisors estimate the difference for himself as based upon the salary schedule of his system. Thus, item 4.5 read: "Compare your salary with the approximate salary you would expect to be earning as a full-time classroom teacher of the deaf in your educational system." The respondent was asked to indicate either that the salaries would be about the same or that the supervisory salary would be higher than the teaching salary by a certain amount. The results are presented in Table 25.

Table 25. Comparison of supervisor and teacher salaries

Difference between salaries	Group S No.	Group S %	Group SA No.	Group SA %	Group S(A)T No.	Group S(A)T %	Total No.	Total %
	Day respondents							
No difference	3	12.0	0	0.0	6	26.0	9	8.3
Up to $399	2	8.0	5	8.3	3	13.0	10	9.2
$400 - 799	4	16.0	4	6.7	4	17.4	12	11.1
$800 - 1199	5	20.0	8	13.3	6	26.0	19	17.6
$1200 - 1599	2	8.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	5	4.7
$1600 or more	7	28.0	33	55.0	3	13.0	43	39.9
No Response	2	8.0	7	11.7	1	4.3	10	9.3
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
No difference	3	6.3	7	9.1	7	28.0	17	11.3
Up to $399	13	27.1	8	10.4	0	0.0	21	14.0
$400 - 799	11	22.9	10	13.0	7	28.0	28	18.7
$800 - 1199	15	31.2	15	19.5	4	16.0	34	22.7
$1200 - 1599	1	2.1	11	14.3	1	4.0	13	8.7
$1600 or more	2	4.2	14	18.2	1	4.0	17	11.3
No Response	3	6.3	12	15.6	5	20.0	20	13.3
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

If the supervisors' estimates may be assumed to be accurate, it would appear that there are wider gaps between supervisory and teaching salaries for Day programs than for Residential programs and that this seems to hold true not only for total groups but also for the three subgroups -- S, SA, and S(A)T. Predictably, the differential is greater in the SA subgroups in both types of programs, followed by decreasingly smaller differentials in the S and S(A)T subgroups.

C. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SUPERVISORY POSITIONS

1. Substitute and tutorial teaching. In addition to regular classroom teaching, discussed previously in section B7, respondents were asked whether they regularly did tutorial teaching (with individuals or small groups) or substitute teaching (e.g., in cases of teacher illness or absence) with either deaf or non-deaf children. The results are shown in Table 26. It can be seen

Table 26. Substitute teaching and tutorial teaching done regularly by supervisor respondents

	Group S		Group SA		Group ST		Group SAT		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents									
Sub. teaching with deaf	3	12.0	10	16.7	1	9.1	6	50.0	20	18.5
Sub. teaching with non-deaf	3	12.0	2	3.3	1	9.1	1	8.3	7	6.5
Tut. teaching with deaf	5	20.0	7	11.7	3	27.3	6	50.0	21	19.4
Tut. teaching with non-deaf	2	8.0	1	1.7	1	9.1	0	0.0	4	3.7
Total*	25		60		11		12		108	
	Residential respondents									
Sub. teaching with deaf	20	41.7	16	20.8	3	27.3	6	42.9	45	30.0
Sub. teaching with non-deaf	0	0.0	2	2.6	0	1.0	1	7.1	3	2.0
Tut. teaching with deaf	13	27.1	9	11.7	2	18.2	6	42.9	30	20.0
Tut. teaching with non-deaf	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	0.0	1	7.1	2	1.3
Total*	48		77		11		14		150	

*There may be more than one answer per respondent

that approximately 19% of the Day respondents do substitute teaching with the deaf. The percentages for work with non-deaf children are 7% for substitute and 4% for tutorial teaching. Subgroup SAT personnel appear to participate most in these types of activities, S's and ST's to a lesser degree, and SA's least of all. The Residential respondents' substitute and tutorial teaching is done almost exclusively with deaf children, and the percentages for all Residential supervisors are 30% for substitute and 20% for tutorial work. As in the Day group, the SAT's appear to be most active in these areas, but among the Residential respondents the S's are the next most active subgroup, followed by the nearly-equivalent ST's and SA's.

One may conclude that approximately equal percentages of Day supervisors and Residential supervisors devote time to regular substitute and tutorial teaching. Most of this work is done with deaf children, but Day supervisors also do work with non-deaf children. In both Day and Residential groups, the Supervisor-administrator-teachers are most active in substitute and tutorial teaching, the Supervisor-administrators the least active.

2. Meetings with individual teachers and groups of teachers. Previous sections revealed a distinction between time devoted to "all supervisory activities" and time devoted specifically to classroom visits. This section and the two following ones attempt to specify some of the "activities" that comprise supervisors' work-loads in addition to classroom visits.

Questionnaire item 2.16 asked each supervisor whether he "consulted with individual teachers of the deaf outside of class visits (conferences not directly related to supervisory visits)". Supervisors were also asked to indicate the approximate number of hours per month devoted to such consultations. The results are presented in Table 27.

It can be seen from the table that nearly all of the Residential and Day supervisors reported holding consultive sessions with individual teachers. It is unfortunate that 11% of the Day and 21% of the Residential respondents did not report consultation time estimates, for these gaps cause problems in interpreting the Residential responses and in comparing Day and Residential supervisors. Nevertheless, some patterns can be deduced from the available data.

Within the total Day group, 59% of the respondents reported spending less than 10 hours per month on individual consultations with teachers, 13% reported 10 to 19 hours per month, and 11% reported 20 hours or more. These trends appear fairly representative of all three Day subgroups (although S subgroup responses must be interpreted with caution, since 24% are not represented). Although 25% of the total Residential group did not report time amounts or did not respond, 33% reported spending less than 10 hours per month on individual consultations, 23% reported 10 to 19 hours per month, and 16% reported 20 or more hours per month.

It may be said that a large majority of all supervisors reported devoting some of their time to individual teacher consultations which were not directly related to supervisory visits. Roughly half of all supervisors devote less than 10 hours a month to this activity; the remainder spend more than 10 hours per month, with a few spending 25 hours or more. While it may be hazardous to make comparisons using rather incomplete data, it would appear that Residential supervisors devote slightly more time to these activities than do Day supervisors.

Table 27. Hours per month devoted to advisory meetings and to consultations with individual teachers of the deaf

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
No. of hours per month	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
None	0	0.0	3	5.0	1	4.3	4	3.7
1 - 4	6	24.0	20	33.3	11	47.8	37	34.3
5 - 9	5	20.0	18	30.0	4	17.4	27	25.0
10-14	5	20.0	8	13.3	0	0.0	13	12.0
15-19	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
20-24	1	4.0	1	1.7	4	17.4	6	5.6
25 or more	2	20.0	5	5.0	1	4.3	6	5.6
Undetermined time	5	20.0	5	8.3	2	8.7	12	11.1
No Response	1	4.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	2	1.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
None	0	0.0	2	2.6	2	8.0	4	2.7
1 - 4	13	27.1	9	11.7	11	44.0	33	22.0
5 - 9	5	10.4	9	11.7	2	8.0	16	10.7
10-14	6	12.5	16	20.8	2	8.0	24	16.0
15-19	4	8.3	5	6.5	2	8.0	11	7.3
20-24	3	6.3	6	7.8	0	0.0	9	6.0
25 or more	2	4.2	11	14.3	2	8.0	15	10.0
Undetermined time	11	23.0	17	22.1	4	16.0	32	21.3
No Response	4	8.3	2	2.6	0	0.0	6	4.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

In addition to individual teacher consultations, supervisors were asked to indicate whether they hold meetings with groups of teachers and, if so, about how many such meetings are held during the course of a year (questionnaire item 2.17). The results are presented in Table 28.

Only 5% of the total supervisors reported no such meetings. The majority of the responses covered a wide range -- from 1 to over 40 meetings per year, and the response patterns of total Day and total Residential groups are remarkably similar. The percentages for the Day group are: 1 to 9 meetings per year, 35%; 10 to 19 meetings, 31%; 20 to 29 meetings, 7%; 30 to 39 meetings, 7%; 40 or

Table 28. Number of supervisory meetings held with groups of teachers during the course of a year

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
No. of meetings	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
None	1	4.0	2	3.3	2	8.7	5	4.6
1 - 4	2	8.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	14	13.0
5 - 9	4	16.0	12	20.0	8	34.8	24	22.2
10 - 14	8	32.0	11	18.3	5	21.7	24	22.2
15 - 19	3	12.0	5	8.3	1	4.3	9	8.3
20 - 29	2	8.0	6	10.0	0	0.0	8	7.4
30 - 39	2	8.0	4	6.7	2	8.7	8	7.4
40 or more	2	8.0	4	6.7	0	0.0	6	5.6
Undetermined	1	4.0	7	11.7	1	4.3	9	8.3
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	1	0.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
None	3	6.3	3	3.9	1	4.0	7	4.7
1 - 4	3	6.3	11	14.3	3	12.0	17	11.3
5 - 9	8	16.7	11	14.3	6	24.0	25	16.7
10 - 14	8	16.7	15	19.5	5	20.0	28	18.7
15 - 19	2	4.2	11	14.3	0	0.0	13	8.7
20 - 29	5	10.4	10	13.0	3	12.0	18	12.0
30 - 39	7	14.6	1	1.3	2	8.0	10	6.7
40 or more	2	4.2	7	9.1	2	8.0	11	7.3
Undetermined	10	20.8	6	7.8	2	8.0	18	12.0
No Response	0	0.0	2	2.6	1	4.0	3	2.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

more, 6%. The corresponding percentages for Residential respondents are 28%, 27%, 12%, 7%, and 7%. Within the Day group the S(A)T's held the least number of meetings per year, while the S and SA subgroups were fairly similar. Within the Residential group, the patterns were less regular and the percentages of undetermined responses larger (e.g., 21% for S's), so that it is difficult to compare types of supervisors.

Item 2.17 also asked "For what purposes are these meetings held?" and provided three spaces for responses. Ninety-one percent of the Day respondents and 90% of the Residential respondents wrote responses to this question, some filling in only one space, others including from two to four items. These responses were tabulated as a list of separate "topic-items", and these totaled 315.

These topic-items were then classified to provide some indication of the primary purposes of these meetings. While topics listed ranged from the very specific to the very general, it was possible to classify most of them under broad headings, although some of these decisions were fairly arbitrary. The major headings, the number of responses for each, and some sample responses are given below.

a) 50 responses. Curriculum (ex.: curriculum changes; to work on curriculum problems; determine direction of curriculum; curriculum study, improvement)
b) 40 responses. In-service activities (ex.: professional study; in-service program; teachers report on various topics; teachers review books and articles; outside speakers; professional improvement)
c) 36 responses. Administrative concerns (ex.: discuss new policies; scheduling of classes; keep teachers informed on administrative affairs; establish policy; administrative announcements)
d) 35 responses. Pupils and classes (discuss class problems; individual student problems; discipline; case studies of children; pupil evaluation; admission and dismissal of pupils; promotion of children)
e) 35 responses. "Program" concerns (ex.: activities concerning the school's program improvement; assembly programs; program planning; discuss improvement and evaluation of program; planning departmental activities)
f) 25 responses. Techniques and methods (ex.: teaching methods and techniques; demonstration of new instructional techniques; discussion of methodology; evaluate procedures being used; new methods)
g) 22 responses. Materials and equipment (ex.: explore new materials; discuss revision of material; developing a curriculum materials center; introduce new materials; order new equipment and supplies)
h) 17 responses. General problem orientation (ex.: discussion of general problems; discuss teachers' problems; problems common to more than one teacher)

i) 15 responses. General discussion orientation (ex.: discuss reports to parents; discuss parent participation)
j) 5 responses. Parents (ex.: plan parent programs; discussing reports to parents; discuss parent participation)
k) 35 responses. Miscellaneous. These responses did not seem to fit under topic-headings a) through j). Some were rather unique, interesting ideas (ex.: one topic within either instruction, curriculum, or materials is given intensive study each time; coordinate the deaf and hearing staff from all school buildings for unity of program; ad hoc committee of teachers of deaf slow-learners; brief meeting before school daily; student teachers). Some were vague and difficult to interpret (ex.: future plans; joint planning; articulation; regular faculty meetings; inform teachers of supervisor meetings; general meetings). A few were, intentionally or unintentionally, rather humorous (ex.: some unusual visitor; some unforeseen panic; additions or deletions; indoctrination).

3. Supervisor participation in professional school activities. In addition to classroom visits and meetings with teachers, it was assumed that supervisors would be involved in many professional activities within their school systems. Thus, questionnaire item 4.1 asked "In what professional school activities did you take part (in addition to your supervisory work) during the 1964-65 school year?". Seven activities were listed with space provided for written-in responses. For each activity, respondents were to indicate either "participated in, engaged in" or "participant and director, officer, coordinator, etc.". The results are presented in Table 29.

If participation (P) and direction (D) are counted together, the activities can be ranked according to frequency of selection by total Day and total Residential supervisors.

Day Respondents:

1. Parent-teacher organization (80%)
2. In-service program for teachers (69%)
3. Selection of textbooks and educational materials (67%)
4. Parent education and counseling program (65%)
5. Curriculum committee (57%)
6. Research related to instruction (34%)
7. Research not directly related to the classroom (19%)
8. "Other" activities (10%)

Residential Respondents

1. Selection of textbooks and educational materials (81%)
2. Parent-teacher organization (74%)
3. Curriculum committee (67%)
4. In-service program for teachers (59%)
5. Parent education and counseling program (39%)
6. Research related to instruction (33%)
7. Research not directly related to the classroom (23%)
8. "Other" activities (21%)

Table 29. Professional school activities which the respondents participated in (P) and directed (D) during the 1964-65 school year

		Day respondents								Residential respondents							
		Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total		Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No participation		1	4.0	2	3.3	2	8.1	5	4.6	1	2.1	5	6.5	0	0.0	6	4.0
Parent-teacher organization	P	6	24.0	29	48.3	12	52.2	47	43.5	37	77.1	30	39.0	15	60.0	82	54.7
	D	9	36.0	23	38.3	7	30.4	39	36.1	5	10.4	21	27.3	3	12.0	29	19.3
Parent education and counseling program	P	4	16.0	25	41.7	4	17.4	33	30.6	10	20.8	12	15.6	5	20.0	27	18.0
	D	11	44.0	16	26.7	10	43.5	37	34.3	3	6.3	23	29.9	6	24.0	32	21.3
In-service program for teachers	P	4	16.0	13	21.7	4	17.4	21	19.4	24	50.0	18	23.4	10	40.0	52	34.7
	D	17	68.0	28	46.7	9	39.1	54	50.0	6	12.5	28	36.4	3	12.0	37	24.7
Curriculum committee	P	8	32.0	17	28.3	2	8.7	27	25.0	25	52.1	24	31.2	5	20.0	54	36.0
	D	9	36.0	18	30.0	7	20.4	34	31.5	8	16.7	33	42.9	5	20.0	46	30.7
Research related to instruction	P	3	12.0	10	16.7	5	21.7	18	16.7	9	18.8	19	24.7	2	8.0	30	20.0
	D	6	24.0	11	18.3	2	8.7	19	17.6	3	6.3	12	15.6	4	16.0	19	12.7
Research not directly related to instruction	P	2	8.0	8	13.3	0	0.0	10	9.3	7	14.6	13	16.9	3	12.0	23	15.3
	D	2	8.0	8	13.3	0	0.0	10	9.3	2	4.2	8	10.4	1	4.0	11	7.3
Selection of textbooks and educational materials	P	7	28.0	23	38.3	10	43.5	40	37.0	30	62.5	24	31.2	13	52.0	67	44.7
	D	10	40.0	16	26.7	6	26.1	32	29.6	10	20.8	39	50.6	5	20.0	54	36.0
Other activities	P	0	0.0	4	6.7	1	4.3	5	4.6	3	6.3	3	3.9	6	30.0	12	8.0
	D	1	4.0	1	1.7	4	17.4	6	5.6	4	8.3	12	15.6	3	15.0	19	12.7
No Response		1	0.0	2	3.3	1	4.3	3	2.8	1	2.1	1	1.3	0	0.0	2	1.3
Totals*		25		60		23		108		48		77		25		150	

*There is more than one answer per respondent

Certain similarities can be seen between Day and Residential groups and appear to be representative of all supervisors. Thus, "parent-teacher organizations" and "selection of texts and educational materials" are high on the list of both groups. "Research" ranks rather low on the activity lists, but it may be noted that one-third of the supervisors are involved in "research related to instruction". Some differences between the two supervisor groups may be due to inherent differences between the two kinds of programs. For instance, Day supervisors are much more likely to be involved in "parent education and counseling programs" since these are facilitated by proximity of home and school. "Selection of texts" would be more crucial for Residential supervisors, whose programs exercise quite a bit of autonomy in choosing texts and series to be used, than for Day supervisors, whose programs tend to adopt texts used by regular classes in the system. The "other" activities listed by respondents covered a range of pursuits so diverse as to defy classification, including such things as the following: teacher training; serving on a building committee for a new school; editor of school paper; planning and helping to produce programs on educational TV for Captioned Films; serving on an evaluation committee for a state board of education; coordinating the school program with dormitory and recreation programs; teaching the i.t.a. to a selected group of pupils; and building a group hearing aid.

Table 29 presents much more data than can be discussed here, and there are some rather subtle differences evident between the S, SA, and S(A)T subgroups, both within and between Day and Residential samples, particularly since comparisons can be made for total participation (P plus D) or for P and D separately. For example, that Residential SA's appear to play relatively stronger leadership roles than S's or S(A)T's, while their leadership is generally less than the S's in the Day programs. Or one might note the stronger administrative roles taken by Day Supervisors in general, due, no doubt, to the fact that they are often one of a small, select group working with the deaf in their school systems.

4. Responsibilities for student teachers. Still another activity to which supervisors devote time involves university students who are engaged in student teaching in the educational settings. As shown in Table 30, 60% of the Day respondents and 71% of the Residential respondents reported that student teachers spent some time in their systems.

Table 30. Responses to the question: "Do student teachers spend time working in your educational system for the deaf?"

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Yes	15	60.0	41	68.3	9	39.1	65	60.2
No	10	40.0	19	31.7	13	56.5	42	38.9
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	1	0.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Yes	38	79.2	54	70.1	15	60.0	107	71.3
No	10	20.8	20	26.0	9	36.0	39	26.0
No Response	0	0.0	3	3.9	1	4.0	4	2.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Table 31 shows the part played by the supervisors in the student teaching program. Although in all categories but two the percentages of the Day supervisors are 5 to 8 points below those of the Residential supervisors (reflecting the 10% difference between the two groups in proportion of supervisors whose systems serve as practicum facilities), the pattern of responses for Day and Residential respondents is quite similar. Roughly one quarter of the respondents have full responsibility for the placement of student teachers in classrooms (Day 27%, Residential 23%) and a similar proportion have partial responsibility for placement (D 23%, R 31%). Much smaller numbers assume full responsibility for supervision of student teachers (D 6%, R 13%), a job that is most generally the responsibility of the university practicum supervisor, but the school supervisors did take a portion of this responsibility for supervision of practicum experience (D 27%, R 34%). A good share of the respondents reported holding meetings with student teacher groups (D 17%, R 25%), and an even larger percentage reported holding conferences with individual student teachers (D 20%, R 37%). Ten percent of the Day and 19% of the Residential respondents reported few or no responsibilities for student teachers in their systems.

Table 31. Responsibilities for student teachers reported by respondents

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Full respons. for placement of st. tchrs. in classrooms	7	28.0	17	28.3	5	21.7	29	26.9
Partial respons. for placement	6	24.0	15	25.0	4	17.4	25	23.1
Full respons. for supervision of st. tchrs. in classrooms	0	0.0	5	8.3	1	4.3	6	5.6
Partial respons. for supervision	8	32.0	15	25.0	6	26.1	29	26.9
Holding meetings with st. tchr. groups	2	8.0	13	21.7	3	13.0	18	16.7
Holding conferences with individual st. tchrs.	4	16.0	14	23.3	4	17.4	22	20.4
Few or no responsibilities	2	8.0	8	13.3	1	4.3	11	10.2
No response; no st. tchrs. in system	10	40.0	19	31.7	14	60.9	43	39.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Full respons. for placement of st. tchrs. in classrooms	11	22.9	16	20.8	7	28.0	34	22.7
Partial respons. for placement	18	37.5	25	32.5	4	16.0	47	31.3
Full respons. for supervision of st. tchrs. in classrooms	5	10.4	7	9.1	8	32.0	20	13.3
Partial respons. for supervision	21	43.8	26	33.8	4	16.0	51	34.0
Holding meetings with st. tchr. groups	16	33.3	17	22.1	4	16.0	37	24.7
Holding conferences with individual st. tchrs.	20	41.7	25	32.5	11	44.0	56	37.3
Few or no responsibilities	12	25.0	14	18.2	2	8.0	28	18.7
No response; no st. tchrs. in system	10	20.8	23	29.9	10	40.0	43	28.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*There is more than one answer per respondent

Within the Day group, the percentages of responses to the categories tends to be lower for the S(A)T subgroup, but fewer of these persons reported student teachers in their school systems. Otherwise, the patterns of responses for the S, SA, and S(A)T subgroups are generally similar. This is not strictly true for the Residential group. Student teachers were reported by 79% of the S subgroup, 70% of the ST subgroup, and 60% of the S(A)T subgroup. The S percentages are 7 to 11 percentage points above the SA subgroup for all categories except full and partial placement responsibility and full supervision responsibility, in which they are similar. The S(A)T percentages tend to be lower than the other two subgroups in most categories. Although they approached the S's and SA's in holding group conferences, they slightly exceed them in full placement responsibility and in holding individual conferences and greatly exceed them in full supervision responsibility.

VI. CLASSROOM VISITS: PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES

Previous chapters have shown that most of the respondents have other job responsibilities in addition to supervision of programs for deaf children. Separate categories (S, SA, and S(A)T) were set up and used as control variables to recognize and point up characteristic differences and similarities that exist between these groups. Yet one thing that all of the respondents have in common is that each has been designated a "supervisor" of classes for the deaf and devotes some portion of his time to "supervisory activities." Since "supervision" may be defined as "the direction and critical evaluation of instruction", it would seem fair to assume that an important component of supervision would be classroom visitation. This chapter, then, focuses specifically on classroom visits, investigating time factors and also procedures and practices used by supervisors in the conduct of these visits.

A. TIME AMOUNTS AND SCHEDULING OF VISITS

1. Total amounts of time devoted to supervisory classroom visits. One basic item of information is the actual amounts of time devoted to visits. Table 32 presents data for questionnaire item 2.3 in terms of hours per month. In interpreting groupings of raw time scores such as these, comparisons between the six subgroups should be made cautiously, keeping in mind certain distinguishing subgroup characteristics (discussed in the preceding chapter) which would affect or determine the actual number of hours spent in visits (e.g., amount of total supervision-time, program sizes, teacher-loads, and the possibility of "responsibility overlap"). As might be expected, there are notable differences for almost every group and subgroup comparison.

In comparing total Day and total Residential supervisors, Table 32 reveals the following percentages (using collapsed table categories): no classroom visits, Day 11%, Residential 12%; 1 - 19 hours per month, D 39%, R 18%; 20 - 39 hours per month, D 20%, R 25%; 40 - 49 hours per month, D 12%, R 16%; 60 or more hours per month, D 12%, R 19%. In all categories above 10 hours per month the percentages of the two groups are similar, although the Residential percentage for each time category is somewhat larger than that for the Day group. The sharpest differences occur in the time category 1 - 9 hours per month, which was responded to by only 6% of the Residential supervisors but by substantially

Table 32. Approximate number of hours per month devoted to supervisory visits in classes for the deaf

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
Hours/month	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
1 - 9	3	12.0	21	35.0	5	21.7	29	26.9
10 - 19	4	16.0	5	8.3	4	17.4	13	12.0
20 - 29	4	16.0	9	15.0	6	26.1	19	17.6
30 - 39	1	4.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	3	2.8
40 - 59	4	16.0	6	10.0	3	13.0	13	12.0
50 - 59	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
60 - 69	4	16.0	1	1.7	1	4.3	6	5.6
70 or more	5	20.0	1	1.7	1	4.3	7	6.5
No Response	0	0.0	6	10.0	0	0.0	6	5.6
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
1 - 9	2	4.2	3	3.9	4	16.0	9	6.0
10 - 19	5	10.4	10	13.0	3	12.0	18	12.0
20 - 29	9	18.7	17	22.1	7	28.0	33	22.0
30 - 39	1	2.1	2	2.6	2	8.0	5	3.3
40 - 49	10	20.8	11	14.3	0	0.0	21	14.0
50 - 59	2	4.2	1	1.3	0	0.0	3	2.0
60 - 69	6	12.5	9	11.7	1	4.0	16	10.7
70 or more	6	12.5	5	6.5	1	4.0	12	8.0
No Response	7	14.6	5	6.5	3	12.0	15	10.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

large proportions of Day SA's and S(A)T's with major responsibilities in addition to supervision.

To facilitate interpretation of the data, a summary comparison based on Table 32 is given below, with time categories collapsed and percentages rounded.

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T	
Hrs./month	Day	Res	Day	Res	Day	Res
None	0%	0%	15%	18%	13%	16%
1 - 19	28%	15%	43%	17%	39%	28%
20 - 39	20%	21%	18%	25%	26%	36%
40 - 59	16%	25%	10%	16%	13%	0%
60 or more	36%	25%	3%	18%	9%	8%
No Response	0%	15%	10%	7%	0%	12%

For Supervisors-only, larger percentages of Day S's than Residential S's reported spending very small amounts of time and very large amounts of time on classroom visits. For moderate amounts of time the two subgroups are similar for 20 - 39 hours per month but the Residential percentage is larger for 40 - 50 hours per month. The relatively large number of Day S's reporting only a few hours per month may be due to the fact that many of them (44%) have teacher-loads of less than ten. On the other hand, it may be noteworthy that a larger proportion of Day S's reported 60 or more hours per month on visits, despite their lighter teacher-loads. In Day-Residential Supervisor-teacher (S(A)T) comparison, differences of one to 13% occur between the two subgroups, but these are confounded by the 12% of the Residential S(A)T's who did not respond to this item and by the fact that the S(A)T figures are based on quite small numbers (Day N23, Residential N25). Visiting-time figures for Day and Residential Supervisor-administrators (SA) appear most closely related to teacher-loads. Thus, of the day SA's, who tend to have lighter loads, 43% report spending 1 - 19 hours per month on visits, with percentages progressively decreasing for larger amounts of time. For the Residential SA's, with heavier loads, the largest percentage (25%) reported 20 - 29 hours per month, with percentages of 16% to 18% reporting other time amounts. In comparing the three supervisor types within the same kind of program, the strongest tendency for both Day and Residential groups appears to be for the Supervisors-only (S) to have the largest percentages reporting 40 - 59 visiting hours per month and 60 or more hours per month, undoubtedly reflecting their heavier teacher-loads and greater time commitments to supervision of classes for the deaf.

Interpretation of these data should be done cautiously because of factors such as the small number of S(A)T's, the occasionally large proportions of No Responses in certain subgroups, and the possibility of "responsibility overlap". It is also possible that the term "time devoted to supervisory visits" may have been interpreted as including travel time to and from classes being visited. This would have little effect on the Residential supervisors, but it might serve to inflate figures for the Day supervisors, who are often required to visit classes in widely-separated locations.

2. Visit-time ratios. The previous section dealt with actual amounts of time devoted to classroom visits. As mentioned, these amounts are influenced by a variety of factors, probably the strongest being supervisory teacher load (and Table 14 has shown that these case-loads range all the way from one to more than fifty teachers). In order to neutralize these differences and to provide a more equitable basis of comparison for all supervisors, "visit-time ratios" were computed to represent approximate number of hours per month per teacher devoted to classroom visits. These ratios were calculated individually for each supervisor by dividing his reported number of hours per month spent in visits to classes for the deaf (questionnaire item 2.3) by the number of academic teachers of the deaf for whom he is responsible (item 1.7). Thus, a visit-time ratio of 4.0 could be assigned to a supervisor of 5 teachers who devotes 20 hours per month to visits or to a supervisor of 15 teachers who spends 60 hours a month on visits. In both instances the supervisor devotes an average of 4 hours a month to visiting for each teacher for whom he is responsible. These ratios, arranged in groupings, are presented in Table 33.

Comparisons of Day and Residential groups and subgroups are impeded somewhat by the large proportions of Residential supervisors whose lack of response to items 2.3 or 1.7 resulted in No Response classifications (Residential S 21%, SA 12%, S(A)T 20%, total 16%). However, in comparing the figures for Day and Residential supervisors who did respond, one is immediately struck by the similarity between the two groups in both total group comparisons and in comparisons by supervisor-types. The percentages are so similar, in fact, that some gross observations can be made by discussing the Day and Residential supervisors together. In can be seen, for instance, that slightly

Table 33. Visit-time ratios: number of hours per month spent visiting each teacher by Day and Residential supervisors

Visit-Time Per Teacher in Hrs./Mo.	Group S No.	Group S %	Group SA No.	Group SA %	Group S(A)T No.	Group S(A)T %	Total No.	Total %
	Day respondents							
0.0 (None)	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
0.1 to 3.9	14	56.0	38	63.3	9	39.1	61	56.5
4.0 to 7.9	11	44.0	7	11.6	7	30.4	25	23.1
8.0 to 11.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.0	3	2.8
12.0 or more	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
No Response	0	0.0	5	8.3	1	4.3	6	5.6
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
0.0 (None)	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
0.1 to 3.9	24	50.0	41	53.3	14	56.0	79	52.7
4.0 to 7.9	12	25.0	11	14.3	2	8.0	25	16.7
8.0 to 11.9	2	4.2	2	2.6	0	0.0	4	2.7
12.0 or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Response	10	20.8	9	11.7	5	20.0	24	16.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

more than 10% of all supervisors devote no time to classroom visits (Day 11%, Residential 13%). More than half spend 0.1 to 3.9 hours per month per teacher on classroom visits (D 57%, R 53%). Approximately 20% have visit-time ratios of 4.0 to 7.9 (D 23%, R 17%), and 3% (D and R) have ratios of 8.0 to 11.9. Only one supervisor reported a ratio of 12.0 or more.

Among the supervisor-type categories, 56% of the Day S's have ratios of 0.1 to 3.9 and 44% have ratios of 4.0 to 7.9. The corresponding percentages for Residential S's are 50% and 25%. None of the Day or Residential S's reported no time devoted to classroom visits. For Supervisor-administrators (SA), the percentages for ratios 0.1 to 3.9 and 4.0 to 7.9 are, respectively, Day: 63%, 12%; Residential: 53%, 14%. Fifteen percent of the Day and 20% of the Residential SA's reported no classroom visits, a fact which tends to bear out the supposition that many of these persons have "generalized" supervisory functions as opposed to direct involvement in classroom proceedings. For the Supervisor-teacher subgroups, 39% of the Day S(A)T's had ratios of 0.1 to 3.9, 30% had ratios of 4.0 to 7.9, and 13% had ratios of 8.0 to 11.9. The corresponding percentages for Residential S(A)T's are 56%, 8%, and 0%. In addition, 13% of the Day and 16% of the Residential S(A)T's reported no time devoted to classroom visits. Thus, among the supervisor-types, Day Supervisors-only (S) and Supervisor-teachers (S(A)T) devote the most time per teacher to classroom visits. These are followed by the Residential S's, Residential SA's, Day SA's, and Residential S(A)T's, in that order.

3. Number of visits per teacher. Another indication of a supervisor's visiting activities, in addition to time spent per teacher, is the number of supervisory visits paid to each teacher over a period of time. To arrive at estimates of these "visit-numbers", questionnaire item 2.10 asked "approximately how many supervisory visits do you pay to an average teacher during the course of a year?", with a blank ("_____ visits") provided for the response. Table 34 presents the grouped visit-number responses.

Two characteristics of Table 34 should be pointed out before analyzing the data. One, unique to this table, is the different-size groupings in the column "No. of Visits" -- groupings by 5's for up to 14 visits per year and by 10's for 20 to 50 or more visits per year. This admittedly awkward situation represents a compromise solution to the problem of how to group most meaningfully, within a reasonable number of categories, responses with a wide-range of scores in which the majority of responses are at one end of the scale. The second noteworthy aspect of Table 34 is the category labeled "No Visits", a category used in all the remaining tables in this chapter. It has just been pointed out that certain respondents reported no supervisory visits to classrooms for the deaf (questionnaire item 2.2). These persons were therefore instructed to ignore subsequent items which related to visit activities (items 2.3 to 2.15). Rather than change the total N's for supervisor groups and subgroups in the tables by eliminating these individuals (who represent 11% of the Day group and 12% of the Residential), it was decided to retain them as nonrespondents. However, to distinguish this

Table 34. Approximate number of visits paid to an average teacher during the course of a year

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
No. of Visits	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
1-4	4	16.0	10	16.7	2	8.7	16	14.8
5-9	3	12.0	13	21.7	2	8.7	18	16.7
10-14	3	12.0	13	21.7	6	26.1	22	20.4
15-19	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	1	0.9
20-29	3	12.0	4	6.7	3	13.0	10	9.3
30-39	5	20.0	4	6.7	5	21.7	14	13.0
40-49	1	4.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	2	1.9
50 or more	2	8.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	5	4.6
"Other" Response	2	8.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	3	2.8
No Response	2	8.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	5	4.6
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
1-4	4	8.3	10	13.0	2	8.0	16	10.7
5-9	4	8.3	12	15.6	3	12.0	19	12.7
10-14	3	6.3	10	13.0	4	16.0	17	11.3
15-19	3	6.3	0	0.0	1	4.0	4	2.7
20-29	4	8.3	5	6.5	2	8.0	11	7.3
30-39	10	20.8	3	3.9	2	8.0	15	10.0
40-49	2	4.2	4	5.2	0	0.0	6	4.0
50 or more	6	12.5	7	9.1	4	16.0	17	11.3
"Other" Response	4	8.3	3	3.9	1	4.0	8	5.3
No Response	8	16.7	9	11.7	2	8.0	19	12.7
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

constant-size group from "No Response" individuals who reported visiting classrooms but did not respond to particular questionnaire items, a separate category was set up and labeled "No Visits".

Returning to the information in Table 34, a comparison between total groups reveals that even though the median number of visits per year per teacher is similar for the two groups (10 - 14 for the Day group, 15 - 19 for the Residential), there is a slight tendency for Day respondents to pay fewer visits to teachers than do Residential respondents and a corresponding tendency for more Residential respondents to pay 40 or more visits per year. This finding appears consistent with the fact that single-location Residential teachers are more accessible to their supervisors than are Day teachers, who are often found in a number of locations within a single system. Some caution should be maintained in this analysis, however, since 19% of the Day and 30% of the Residential groups are not represented in the visit-number categories.

In comparing Day and Residential supervisor-types the same tendency, for Day respondents to pay slightly fewer visits, may be noted. This is especially true of the S and SA subgroups. In looking at supervisor-types within types of programs, patterns are somewhat irregular, but the general trend within both Day and Residential groups appears to be for Supervisor-administrators to pay the fewest (1 - 9) visits to teachers, for Supervisor-teachers to predominate in the 10 - 14 visits per year category, and for Supervisors-only to pay among the highest number (20 - 39) of visits per year. In the category "40 or more visits", S's tend to excel in the Day group, while the differences are less clear-cut in the Residential group. In noting these trends it should be cautioned that a good share of the supervisors are not included in this coverage, for although respondent percentages are based upon total N's for each subgroup, the "Other Response", "No Response", and "No Visits" categories account for anywhere from 16% (Day S) to 34% (Residential SA) of the subgroup supervisors.

The "other" responses -- written-in responses that could not be categorized precisely -- are interesting in themselves. Some merely reflected difficulties in specifying the actual number of visits paid to teachers, but others touched upon a factor not included in the questionnaire -- the relation of "number of visits" to the relative experience or inexperience of teachers.

4. Time length of supervisory visits. Still another parameter of supervisory visits is their length. Naturally this varies, depending upon the purpose of the visit, the teacher's need for supervision, the supervisor's view of his visiting responsibilities, and other factors. Nonetheless, it seemed desirable to explore the approximate amounts of time

devoted to single classroom visits, and this was done by asking the respondents to estimate minutes spent during "shorter", "longer", and "average" visits (questionnaire item 2.4).

The responses are summarized in Tables 35, 36, and 37. The questionnaire responses were given in actual minutes. A number of time categories were considered for presenting the data, and 20-minute intervals were finally selected, since they included but differentiated between the frequently-given responses based on quarter hour periods (15, 30, 45 minutes, etc.) and since they proved most applicable to all three time-length types. One thing to be kept in mind in interpreting the following results is the rather large proportion of SA's and S(A)T's who reportedly do not visit classrooms at all.

Table 35. Estimated lengths of "shorter" supervisory classroom visits

Visits Lengths in Minutes	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
1 - 19	7	28.0	27	45.0	14	60.9	48	44.4
20 - 39	13	52.0	17	28.3	0	0.0	30	27.8
40 - 59	2	8.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	3	2.8
60 - 79	2	8.0	1	1.7	2	8.7	5	4.6
80 - 99	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
100 - 119	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
120 or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	1	0.9
No Response	1	4.0	5	8.3	3	13.0	9	8.3
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
1 - 19	31	64.6	51	66.2	12	48.0	94	62.7
20 - 39	12	25.0	9	11.7	5	20.0	26	17.3
40 - 59	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.7
60 - 79	0	0.0	2	2.6	1	4.0	3	2.0
80 - 99	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
100 - 119	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
120 or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Response	5	10.4	0	0.0	3	12.0	8	5.3
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

a. "Shorter" Visits (Table 35). Among Day supervisors, members of the supervisor-only (S) subgroup apparently spend more time in the classroom during their shorter visits. Twenty-eight percent report 1 - 19 minutes, 52% report 20 - 39 minutes, and 16% report 40 minutes or more. Supervisor-administrators (SA) are second in length of shorter visits with percentages of 45% for 1 - 19 minutes, 28% for 20 - 29 minutes, and 3% for 40 minutes or more. The supervisor-teachers (S(A)T) apparently spend the least amount of time. Sixty-one percent reported 1 - 19 minutes and 13% reported 40 minutes or more. The differences between supervisor types are less clear-cut in the Residential group. The largest time category for all three types is 1 - 19 minutes (S, 65%; SA, 66%; S(A)T, 48%). The second largest category is 20 - 39 minutes (S, 25%; SA, 12%; S(A)T, 20%). The percentages of Residential respondents reporting 40 minutes or more are very small (S, 0%; SA, 4%; S(A)T, 4%). Taken as groups, the Day supervisors appear to spend more time during their "shorter" visits than do Residential supervisors (1 - 19 min.: Day 44%, Residential 63%; 20 - 39 min.: D 28%, R 17%; 40 min. or more: D 8%, R 3%).

b. "Longer Visits" (Table 36). Among Day supervisors, the S group again appears to spend the greatest amounts of time. Only 32% report spending less than an hour during longer visits, and 64% report 60 minutes or more. In fact, 32% report two hours or more. Both SA and S(A)T groups appear to spend less time than the S group on longer visits. The differences between SA's and S(A)T's do not appear to be as great as they are for shorter visits, though it is difficult to say this with any certainty, since only 65% of the S(A)T's are represented for this item. For those who did respond, 42% of the SA's and 30% of the S(A)T's report less than an hour, 33% of the SA's and 35% of the S(A)T's report an hour or more. For the Residential group, the S's are again at the top of the list, with 33% reporting an hour or more for longer visits and only 50% reporting less than an hour. For the Residential SA's, 70% spend less than one hour, 8% more than an hour. For the S(A)T's (only 68% of whom are represented), 52% report less than an hour, 16% an hour or more. A comparison of Day and Residential groups reveals that 37% of the Day and 61% of the Residential supervisors report spending less than an hour on longer classroom visits, while 41% of the Day and 17% of the Residential respondents spend an hour or more.

Table 36. Estimated lengths of "longer" supervisory classroom visits

Visit Lengths in Minutes	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
1 - 19	0	0.0	1	1.7	2	8.7	3	2.8
20 - 39	2	8.0	12	20.0	3	13.0	17	15.7
40 - 59	6	24.0	12	20.0	2	8.7	20	18.5
60 - 79	7	28.0	13	21.7	5	21.7	25	23.1
80 - 99	1	4.0	2	3.3	1	4.3	4	3.7
100 - 119	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
120 or more	8	32.0	5	8.3	2	8.7	15	13.9
No Response	1	4.0	6	10.0	5	21.7	12	11.1
No Visits	1	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
1 - 19	0	0.0	3	3.9	1	4.0	4	2.7
20 - 39	12	25.0	31	40.3	5	20.0	48	32.0
40 - 59	12	25.0	20	26.0	7	28.0	39	26.0
60 - 79	12	25.0	4	5.2	2	8.0	18	12.0
80 - 99	3	6.3	1	1.3	1	4.0	5	3.3
100 - 119	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
120 or more	1	2.1	1	1.3	1	4.0	3	2.0
No Response	8	16.7	3	3.9	4	16.0	15	10.0
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

c. "Average" visits (Table 37). In addition to shorter and longer visits, respondents were asked to estimate amounts of time spent during "average" visits, and perhaps these figures present the truest indication of the typical length of classroom visits. In the Day group, it is difficult to say whether the S's or the S(A)T's spend more time during average visits, particularly since not all of the S(A)T's responded to this item or because they reported no visits. The percentages for the various time periods are: 1 - 19 minutes (S, 0%; S(A)T, 9%); 20 - 39 min. (S, 52%; S(A)T, 35%); 40 - 59 min. (S, 12%; S(A)T, 9%); 60 - 79 min. (S, 16%; S(A)T, 26%); 80 min. or more (S, 20%; S(A)T, 4%). Day SA's report somewhat shorter visit times, with 8% reporting 1 - 19 minutes, 45% reporting 20 - 39 minutes; 18% reporting 40 - 59 minutes; and 7% reporting an hour or more. As in the case of the S(A)T's, a large proportion did not answer this item. Among the Residential supervisors, the S's tend to have the longest average visits, followed by the S(A)T's, and then by the SA's. The percentages for the groups are: 1 - 19 minutes (S, 8%; SA, 30%; S(A)T, 16%); 20 - 39 minutes (S, 58%; SA, 39%; S(A)T, 40%); 40 - 59 minutes (S, 21%; SA, 5%; S(A)T, 12%); 60 minutes or more (S, 2%; SA, 1%; S(A)T, 4%). In comparing total groups, the Day supervisors appear to spend longer amounts of time during average visits. (1 - 19 min.: Day 7%, Residential 21%; 20 - 39 min.: D 44%, R 45%; 40 - 59 min.: D 15%, R 11%; 60 - 79 min.: D 11%, R 2%; 80 min. or more: D 7%, R 0%).

Table 37. Estimated lengths of "average" supervisory classroom visits

Visit Lengths in Minutes	Group S No.	Group S %	Group SA No.	Group SA %	Group S(A)T No	Group S(A)T %	Total No.	Total %
	Day respondents							
1 - 19	0	0.0	5	8.3	2	8.7	7	6.5
20 - 39	13	52.0	27	45.0	8	34.8	48	44.4
40 - 59	3	12.0	11	18.3	2	8.7	16	14.8
60 - 79	4	16.0	2	3.3	6	26.1	12	11.1
80 - 99	3	12.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	5	4.6
100 - 119	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
120 or more	2	8.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	3	2.8
No Response	0	0.0	4	6.7	1	4.3	5	4.6
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
1 - 19	4	8.3	23	29.9	4	16.0	31	20.7
20 - 39	28	58.3	30	39.0	10	40.0	68	45.3
40 - 59	10	20.8	4	5.2	3	12.0	17	11.3
60 - 79	1	2.1	1	1.3	1	4.0	3	2.0
80 - 99	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
100 - 119	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
120 or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Response	5	10.4	5	6.5	3	12.0	13	8.7
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

From the data on visit times just presented, three trends seem quite definite. First, for both Day and Residential groups, S's or Supervisors-only tend to spend more time per visit on shorter-, longer-, and average-length visits than do SA's and S(A)T's. Second, SA's and S(A)T's occasionally devote similar amounts of time to visits, but the trend is for S(A)T's to spend more time per visit than the SA's. Third, for all three visit lengths, Day supervisors as a group spend slightly more time per visit than do Residential supervisors. All of these results, however, should be interpreted in conjunction with preceding sections to obtain a complete picture of the quantitative aspect of supervisory visits.

5. Scheduling of visits. Two questionnaire items were concerned with how much notification time supervisors give to teachers in scheduling supervisory classroom visits. Item 2.11 asked: "Approximately what percent of your visits are 'surprise visits' in which the teacher is not informed of your coming ahead of time?". Item 2.12 asked: "In your scheduled visits, how much notice is the teacher generally given?". Responses to these items are contained in Tables 38 and 39.

The responses regarding surprise visits for total Day and total Residential groups are quite similar, differing substantially on only two of the percentage categories. One of these was the 0% category ("no surprise visits"), which was responded to by 13% of the Day and 4% of the Residential supervisors. For succeeding categories, responses were: 1- 19% surprise visits (Day and Residential 7%); 20 - 39% (D 4%, R 3%); 40 - 49% (D and R 20%); 60 - 79% (D 12%, R 9%). In the 80 - 99% category the responses were D 18%, R 27%. And 11 to 13% of the respondents indicated that in 100% of their supervisory visits the teachers were not notified ahead of time.

It is somewhat difficult to interpret meaningfully the responses to the item concerning amount of notification time given to teachers prior to a visit (Table 39), since 28% of the Day and 31% of the Residential supervisors did not answer this question. This is understandable, since lack of response could indicate "No Visits", "No Response", or 100% surprise visits. However, there appears to be a tendency for total Residential supervisors to give less advance notice (39% checked "a few hours" or "one day") and the Day supervisors to give more notice (47% checked "two days", "3 - 6 days", or "a week or more"). All three types of Residential supervisors have similar patterns of response to this item, adhering fairly closely to the total percentages of: "a few hours",

Table 38. Approximate percentage of visits which are "surprise visits" (teacher not informed of supervisor's coming ahead of time)

	Group S No.	Group S %	Group SA No.	Group SA %	Group S(A)T No.	Group S(A)T %	Total No.	Total %
	Day respondents							
0% (None)	4	16.0	5	8.3	5	21.7	14	13.0
1 - 19%	2	8.0	2	3.3	3	13.0	7	6.5
20 - 39%	1	4.0	1	1.7	2	8.7	4	3.7
40 - 59%	4	16.0	14	23.3	4	17.4	22	20.4
60 - 79%	7	28.0	6	10.0	0	0.0	13	12.0
80 - 99%	3	12.0	12	20.0	4	17.4	19	17.6
100%	4	16.0	8	13.3	2	8.7	14	13.0
No Response	0	0.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	3	2.8
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
0% (None)	3	6.3	2	2.6	1	4.0	6	4.0
1 - 19%	3	6.3	4	5.2	3	12.0	10	6.7
20 - 39%	1	2.1	0	0.0	3	12.0	4	2.7
40 - 59%	15	31.3	10	13.0	5	20.0	30	20.0
60 - 79%	5	10.4	6	7.8	3	12.0	14	9.3
80 - 99%	13	27.1	26	33.8	2	8.0	41	27.3
100%	4	8.3	12	15.6	1	4.0	17	11.3
No Response	4	8.3	3	3.9	3	12.0	10	6.7
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

19%; "one day", 20%; "two days", 11%; "3 - 6 days", 12%; and "a week or more", 5%. Day S, SA, and S(A)T subgroups were also quite similar to the total responses of: "a few hours", 7%; "one day", 16%; "two days", 17%; "3 - 6 days", 19%; and "a week or more", 12%. Significant exceptions to this pattern were the Day S's, none of whom checked "a few hours" and 32% of whom checked "one day", and Day S(A)T's on the categories "two days" (4%) and "3 - 6 days" (30%).

Table 39. Notification-time given teachers for scheduled visits

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
A few hours	0	0.0	5	8.3	3	13.0	8	7.4
One day	8	32.0	6	10.0	3	13.0	17	15.7
Two days	5	20.0	12	20.0	1	4.3	18	16.7
3 - 6 days	4	16.0	9	15.0	7	30.4	20	18.5
A week or more	3	12.0	8	13.3	2	8.7	13	12.0
"Other" response	1	4.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	2	1.9
No Response	4	16.0	10	16.7	4	17.4	18	16.7
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
A few hours	9	18.8	16	20.8	4	16.0	29	19.3
One day	8	16.7	17	22.1	5	20.0	30	20.0
Two days	8	16.7	5	6.5	3	12.0	16	10.7
3 - 6 days	6	12.5	9	11.7	3	12.0	18	12.0
A week or more	4	8.3	1	1.3	2	8.0	7	4.7
"Other" response	3	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.0
No Response	10	20.8	15	19.5	4	16.0	29	19.3
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

B. SUPERVISORY VISIT ACTIVITIES

1. Topics discussed during supervisory visits. Questionnaire item 2.5 asked the supervisors to check three (out of a given seven) topics which seemed to be of the most concern to teachers whom they visited. Topics listed, along with their "short reference forms" which are used in the discussion, were (in order of presentation in the questionnaire):

a) Behavior (Behavior problems and adjustment difficulties of children)
b) Class administration (Classroom administration -- scheduling, grouping, etc.)
c) Home-school (Home-school relations; parents and parent counseling)
d) Teaching (Teaching techniques and materials)
e) Special techniques (Special techniques for specific children in the class)
f) Extracurricular (Extracurricular activities of the children)
g) Administration (Administrative concerns -- psychological testing, class compositions, reports, etc.)

Two spaces were also provided for respondents to write in other topics. Summary Table 40 presents the topics and percentages in order of decreasing preference for each subgroup and for total groups.

Perhaps the most striking finding is the agreement in topic order-of-importance for total Day and Residential groups. Both groups find teachers attaching great importance to "teaching techniques and materials", "behavior and adjustment concerns for the children", and "special techniques for specific children", followed by "home-school relations" (for the Day group only), "classroom administration concerns", "general administrative concerns", and "home-school relations" (Residential group). "Extracurricular activities", last on the list for both groups, appears to be a negligible concern of teachers. It appears from these listings that the topics most-discussed with teachers revolve around techniques of instruction and ways of handling particular children in the class. The relatively high rating accorded "home-school relations" by Day supervisors probably reflects this type of contact which is fostered by Day programs.

Table 40. Topics discussed with teachers during supervisory visits (Note: Percentages indicate proportions of respondents within each category who checked the items. There is more than one response for each respondent)

Day respondents

Order	S		SA		S(A)T		Total	
1.	Teaching	92%	Behavior	60%	Class admin.	74%	Teaching	68%
2.	Behavior	60%	Teaching	58%	Teaching	65%	Behavior	61%
3.	Spec. tech.	56%	Home-school	47%	Behavior	65%	Spec. tech.	48%
4.	Home-school	32%	Spec. tech.	42%	Home-school	61%	Home-school	46%
5.	Class admin.	32%	Class admin.	30%	Spec. tech.	57%	Class admin.	40%
6.	Admin.	32%	Admin.	28%	Admin.	30%	Admin.	30%
7.	Extracurr.	0%	Extracurr.	7%	Extracurr.	9%	Extracurr.	6%

Residential respondents

Order	S		SA		S(A)T		Total	
1.	Teaching	90%	Behavior	69%	Teaching	80%	Teaching	74%
2.	Behavior	85%	Teaching	62%	Behavior	68%	Behavior	74%
3.	Spec. tech.	80%	Spec. tech.	58%	Spec. tech.	60%	Spec. tech.	65%
4.	Class admin.	31%	Admin.	22%	Class admin.	24%	Class admin.	25%
5.	Admin.	13%	Class admin.	21%	Admin.	16%	Admin.	18%
6.	Home-school	8%	Home-school	14%	Home-school	12%	Home-school	12%
7.	Extracurr.	2%	Extracurr.	4%	Extracurr.	0%	Extracurr.	3%

While the ordering of topics is almost the same for both major groups, there are differences in percentages responding to various topics. Thus, Day percentages are in the 60's for "teaching" and "behavior" and in the 40's for "special techniques", "home-school relations", and "classroom administration", indicating relatively high responses to all of these topics. Even "general administrative concerns" was checked by 30% of the Day supervisors. The pattern is somewhat different for Residential respondents. The most frequently-checked items are "teaching" (74%), "behavior" (74%), and "special techniques" (65%). All other topics show a sharp drop-off of responses.

There are also differences between subgroups (S, SA, and S(A)T) within the Day and Residential groups, as shown in the summary table. Day subgroups generally follow the trends just discussed for the group as a whole but with some exceptions. In the Day S subgroup, for example, almost all respondents (92%) checked "teaching techniques", and "home-school relations", "classroom administration", and "general administrative concerns" each were checked by about one-third of the respondents. Day SA's display the fewest contrasts in preference for specific topics: with the exception of the extremely low 7% for "extracurricular activities", there is a relatively small range between the most-checked item (general administrative concerns, 28%) and the least-checked (behavior, 60%) item. In fact, it is somewhat surprising that administrative topics should rank so low among topics discussed with teachers by Supervisor-administrators. Day S(A)T's reveal somewhat higher concern than the other two subgroups on the topics of "home-school relations" and "special techniques for specific children". The Residential subgroups are remarkable in their unanimity -- with one minor exception they all follow exactly the same order-ranking for topics for discussion. In considering percentages, there is some similarity to the Day subgroups in that a very high proportion of S's (90%) checked "teaching techniques" and the range of percentages for the SA's (14 - 69%, excluding "extracurricular activities") was the smallest of the three subgroups. It may also be noted that for both Residential S and S(A)T's there is an extremely sharp drop in percentages between the top three topics and the remaining four topics.

2. Visiting activities. In addition to topics discussed during supervisory visits, it seemed appropriate to investigate the types of "activities"

supervisors engaged in during these visits. Questionnaire item 2.6 asked "Approximately what percent of your time during a visit is devoted to the following activities?". Spaces were provided for respondents to write in percentage figures for "observing the teacher and children at work" and "conferring with the teacher", and additional spaces were provided in which respondents could note other activities.

Table 41 presents figures for combinations of visiting activity combinations checked by the respondents. Although many possible combinations

Table 41. Combinations of visiting activity categories checked by respondents

Key: Observing: Observing the teacher and children at work
Conferring: Conferring with the teacher
Other: Miscell. activities written in by respondents

Combinations	Group S No.	Group S %	Group SA No.	Group SA %	Group S(A)T No.	Group S(A)T %	Total No.	Total %
	Day respondents							
Observing and Conferring	17	68.0	28	46.7	7	30.4	52	48.1
Observing, Conferring and Other	7	28.0	7	11.7	9	39.1	23	21.3
Observing only	1	4.0	14	23.3	2	8.7	17	15.7
Observing and Other	0	0.0	2	3.3	1	4.3	3	2.8
Other only	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	1	0.9
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Observing and Conferring	21	43.8	39	50.6	14	56.0	74	49.3
Observing, Conferring and Other	18	37.5	10	13.0	6	24.0	34	22.7
Observing only	3	6.3	5	6.5	1	4.0	9	6.0
Observing and Other	5	10.4	4	5.2	0	0.0	9	6.0
Other only	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.7
No Response	1	2.1	4	5.2	0	0.0	5	3.3
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

were available as a result of choosing one, two, three, or four of the categories, in fact only five combinations proved practical for analysis, for "conferring" alone was never checked and very few respondents added activities to other categories.

The category rankings are the same for both total Day and total Residential groups. Nearly half of the Day and Residential respondents reported "observing and conferring" as their only choice. For "observing, conferring, and other" the percentages were much lower (D 21%, R 23%), and the percentages dropped for "observing only" (D 16%, R 6%), "observing and other" (D 3%, R 6%), and "other only" (D 1%, R 1%). This ordering of categories generally holds true for subgroups also.

Additional analyses of the data reveal, as might be expected, that larger proportions of visiting time are devoted to observation of the teacher and children than to conferring with the teachers. Thus, the median percentage category for "observing" is 60 - 79% for both total Day and total Residential supervisors; for "conferring" it is 20 - 39% for both groups. In addition, 31% of the Day and 38% of the Residential supervisors reported 80 - 100% of the visiting time devoted to observation. (Sixteen percent of the Day supervisors, in fact, reported 100% time devoted to observation.)

3. Demonstration of techniques during visits. In order to investigate further some specific procedures used in supervision, respondents were asked (questionnaire item 2.9): "During your visits do you demonstrate techniques by working with the children yourself?". One response was to be checked out of those given: "very frequently, frequently, occasionally, seldom, never."

It can be seen in Table 42 that the distributions for total groups are very similar, although the Residential group checked "occasionally" somewhat more frequently. The percentages are as follows: "very frequently" (Day 16%, Residential 11%); "frequently" (D 14%, R 13%); "occasionally" (D 32%, R 45%); "seldom" (D 11%, R 13%); "never" (D 1%, R 5%). Evidently on-the-spot demonstrations have proven useful in showing teachers instructional procedures, for around two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they do this at least occasionally.

There are some differences between Day and Residential supervisors of the same type. The distributions for supervisors-only (S) are roughly similar, with the two groups differing most in the category "very frequently" (D 28%, R 17%). There are more striking differences between Supervisor-administrator

(SA) groups, and the patterning of responses seems to indicate that the Day SA's, as a group, are less likely to demonstrate techniques than are Residential SA's. It may be conjectured that SA's found in Residential schools for the deaf are more likely than Day SA's to have backgrounds in this area and thus to be more familiar with instructional procedures used with the deaf. There is a trend in the opposite direction for the Supervisor-teachers, with 56% of the Day and 20% of the Residential respondents responding "very frequently" and "frequently", 17% Day and 48% Residential responding "occasionally", and 13% Day and 16% Residential responding "seldom" or "never".

Table 42. Responses indicating how frequently supervisors demonstrate techniques by working with the children themselves

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Very frequently	7	28.0	2	3.3	8	34.8	17	15.7
Frequently	5	20.0	5	8.3	5	21.7	15	13.9
Occasionally	11	44.0	19	31.7	4	17.4	34	31.5
Seldom	0	0.0	10	16.7	2	8.7	12	11.1
Never	2	8.0	14	23.3	1	4.3	17	15.7
No Response	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Very frequently	8	16.7	7	9.1	2	8.0	17	11.3
Frequently	12	25.0	4	5.2	3	12.0	19	12.7
Occasionally	24	50.0	32	41.6	12	48.0	68	45.3
Seldom	4	8.3	14	18.2	2	8.0	20	13.3
Never	0	0.0	6	7.8	2	8.0	8	5.3
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

In comparing supervisor-types within Day programs, there appears to be a slight tendency for S(A)T's to demonstrate techniques more frequently than S's and for both of these subgroups to do so far more than SA's. Within the Residential programs, there is a definite tendency for S's to demonstrate techniques more often than both the SA and S(A)T subgroups, whose response distributions are fairly similar.

4. Offering suggestions and comments while class is in session. In terms of supervisor involvement with ongoing classwork, an activity one step removed from actual demonstration of techniques might be the offering of comments and discussion of techniques with the teacher while class is in session. Questionnaire item 2.7 asked the supervisors to rate this type of activity as to its usefulness. The results are given in Table 43.

Table 43. Responses indicating the usefulness of offering comments and discussing teaching techniques with the teacher while the class is in session

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Extremely useful	2	8.0	2	3.3	8	34.8	12	11.1
Quite useful	6	24.0	3	5.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Moderately useful	2	8.0	9	15.0	2	8.7	13	12.0
Of some use	6	24.0	16	26.7	4	17.4	26	24.1
Not useful	9	36.0	20	33.3	3	13.0	32	29.6
No Response	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Extremely useful	5	10.4	5	6.5	3	12.0	13	8.7
Quite useful	6	12.5	7	9.1	1	4.0	14	9.3
Moderately useful	9	18.8	11	14.3	5	20.0	25	16.7
Of some use	17	35.4	21	27.3	6	24.0	44	29.3
Not useful	8	16.7	18	23.4	5	20.0	31	20.7
No Response	3	6.2	1	1.3	1	4.0	5	3.3
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Total Day and total Residential distributions for this item are similar: "extremely useful" (Day 11%, Residential 9%); "quite useful" (D 11%, R 9%); "moderately useful" (D 12%, R 17%); "of some use" (D 24%, R 29%); and "not useful" (D 30%, R 21%). The response percentages for "extremely useful" are less than 15% for all subgroups (with the exception of the Day S(A)T's, 35%), and the same is true for "quite useful" (except for Day S's, 24%). Response percentages for most subgroups (except for Day S(A)T's) tend to be 20% or more for the other categories.

The response patterns are fairly similar for Day and Residential Supervisor-administrators (SA), who evidently find this activity of limited usefulness. Day Supervisor-teachers (S(A)T) appear to find offering comments during class sessions more useful than do Residential S(A)T's. The response patterns of Day and Residential Supervisors-only (S) are irregular and present no definite trends.

5. Conferences with teachers concerning visits. Offering comments during class sessions is one way for a supervisor to guide a teacher in her use of instructional procedures. Supervisory conferences, in addition to or instead of in-session comments, might be expected to permit even fuller discussion of procedures and allow for coverage of a wide range of other topics. Item 2.8 asked the supervisors "do you hold conferences with teachers concerning visits?", and those who answered in the affirmative were asked to indicate the approximate percentage of their visits that included or were followed by conferences. These responses are combined for presentation in Table 44.

Total Day and total Residential groups differ very little in their responses to the percentage categories, with the exception of the 100% category (all visits including or followed by conferences), which includes 29% of the Day and 10% of the Residential respondents. Response percentages for the other categories are: 0% or "no conferences with teachers visited" (Day 5%, Residential 9%); 1 - 19% (D 5%, R 7%); 20 - 39% (D 7%, R 10%); 40 - 59% (D 18%, R 23%); 60 - 79% (D 7%, R 14%); and 80 - 99% (D 15%, R 8%). The most evident pattern is for the Day supervisors to respond somewhat less frequently to all categories for 0% to 79% but to make up for these differences in the two highest categories. These data suggest a tendency for Day supervisors to hold visit-related conferences with teachers more consistently than do Residential supervisors.

This same patterning is reflected to some degree in comparison of Supervisor-administrators (SA) and Supervisor-teachers (S(A)T) from the two types of facilities. The trend is somewhat less consistent for Day and Residential Supervisors-only.

Table 44. Percentage of classroom visits which include or are followed by conferences concerning the visits

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
0% (No conferences)	1	4.0	3	5.0	1	4.3	5	4.6
1 - 19%	1	4.0	4	6.7	0	0.0	5	4.6
20 - 39%	2	8.0	5	8.3	0	0.0	7	6.5
40 - 59%	4	16.0	10	16.7	5	21.7	19	17.6
60 - 79%	2	8.0	4	6.7	2	8.7	8	7.4
80 - 99%	8	32.0	6	10.0	2	8.7	16	14.8
100%	5	20.0	16	26.7	10	43.5	31	28.7
"Other" Response	2	8.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.9
No Response	0	0.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	3	2.8
No Visits	0	0.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	12	11.1
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
0% (No conferences)	2	4.2	8	10.4	4	16.0	14	9.3
1 - 19%	3	6.2	6	7.8	1	4.0	10	6.7
20 - 39%	1	2.1	13	16.9	1	4.0	15	10.0
40 - 59%	16	33.3	15	19.5	3	12.0	34	22.7
60 - 79%	10	20.8	8	10.4	3	12.0	21	14.0
80 - 99%	7	14.6	3	3.9	2	8.0	12	8.0
100%	6	12.5	5	6.5	4	16.0	15	10.0
"Other" Response	1	2.1	2	2.6	0	0.0	3	2.0
No Response	2	4.2	3	3.9	3	12.0	8	5.3
No Visits	0	0.0	14	18.2	4	16.0	18	12.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

6. Written reports of supervision visits. Questionnaire item 2.13 asked supervisors whether they prepared written reports of supervisory visits and, if so, approximately what percent of their visits were thus documented. Only 37% of the total Day supervisors and 15% of the Residential respondents reported writing reports. Nine percent of the Day and 4% of the Residential respondents indicated that all visits were reported in written form. The remainder of the responses were scattered rather equally over percentages from 1 to 99%, with few discernible patterns between and among subgroups.

Those who responded affirmatively to the above item were asked "if you do prepare reports, what is done with copies of the reports?" Four choices were given (with spaces for additional responses), and the respondents were asked to check any number of appropriate items. Since a majority checked two or more items, there is a great deal of overlap in the resulting percentages: written reports retained in supervisory files (Day 37%, Residential 13%); sent to superintendent or vice-superintendent (D 15%, R 9%); sent to principal (D 11%, R 7%); sent to the teacher (D 22%, R 4%).

VII. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE RESPONDENTS

A. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Sex of respondents. Table 45 presents information on the sex of respondents to this questionnaire (item 6.1). The data show very little difference between the total Day and Residential groups on this factor: slightly over half of the supervisors in both types of programs are females.

Within the Day group, approximately two-thirds of the Supervisors-only (S) and Supervisor-teachers (S(A)T) are females, while this is true for only half of the Supervisor-administrators (SA). For the Residential group the percentages of females are 73% for the S subgroup, 56% for the S(A)T subgroup, and 39% for the SA subgroup. The only category in which the number of males nearly equals or exceeds the number of females is that involving supervision and administration (Day SA's 48%, Residential SA's 61%).

Table 45. Sex of respondents

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Female	17	68.0	30	50.0	16	69.6	63	58.3
Male	8	32.0	29	48.3	7	30.4	44	40.7
No Response	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Female	35	72.9	30	39.0	14	56.0	79	52.7
Male	12	25.0	47	61.0	11	44.0	70	46.7
No Response	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

2. Ages of respondents. Table 46 (based on item 6.2) shows that the largest numbers of respondents in both groups are in their 50's. However, the Day-supervisors as a whole are somewhat younger than their Residential counterparts: 58% of the former group are under 50, while this is true for only 44% of the latter group. The same trend holds true for Day-Residential subgroup comparisons.

Within the Day group, the subgroup percentages are fairly consistent, minor exceptions being the S(A)T's, who have the highest proportion of under-30's and the SA's, who are somewhat older than the other two subgroups. Discrepancies are more apparent between the Residential subgroups: around half of the SA's and S(A)T's are under 50 while nearly 70% of the S's are 50 or older.

Table 46. Ages of respondents

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Under 30	0	0.0	1	1.7	3	13.0	4	3.7
30 - 39	7	28.0	12	20.0	5	21.7	24	22.2
40 - 49	9	36.0	19	31.7	7	30.4	35	32.4
50 - 59	8	32.0	23	38.3	8	34.8	39	36.1
60 - 69	1	4.0	4	6.7	0	0.0	5	4.6
70 or older	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Response	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Under 30	0	0.0	4	5.2	1	4.0	5	3.3
30 - 39	5	10.4	17	22.1	4	16.0	26	17.3
40 - 49	9	18.8	19	24.7	7	28.0	35	23.3
50 - 59	18	37.5	25	32.5	11	44.0	54	36.0
60 - 69	15	31.3	11	14.3	2	8.0	28	18.7
70 or older	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.7
No Response	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

3. Hearing loss. Responses to questionnaire item 6.3 indicate that 16 supervisors have hearing losses. Five of these are Day respondents: 2 S's (one mild, one profound); 1 SA (mild); and 2 S(A)T's (one mild, one moderate). Eleven Residential respondents reported losses ranging from mild to profound: 3 S's; 5 SA's; and 3 S(A)T's (most did not report degrees of loss). Two Day and two Residential respondents reported wearing hearing aids.

B. ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

Questionnaire items 3.1 through 3.3 requested information concerning academic degrees earned, those currently being worked on, and non-degree coursework taken by the respondents. A wealth of information was received, only a portion of which can be presented in this report.

1. Highest earned academic degrees. Table 47 shows that the bachelor's degree is the highest level reached by 9% of the Day and 19% of the Residential supervisors. The majority of the respondents have achieved the master's degree level (Day 82%, Residential 67%), and a few have earned doctorates (D 7%, R 3%). One Day and 15 Residential respondents left this item blank, indicating either a true No Response despite degrees held or lack of any academic degrees.

Table 47. Highest earned academic degrees

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Bachelor's degree	2	8.0	1	1.7	7	30.4	10	9.3
Master's degree	21	84.0	54	90.0	14	60.9	89	82.4
Doctoral degree	2	8.0	5	8.3	0	0.0	7	6.5
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	1	0.9
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	1	0.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Bachelor's degree	14	29.2	10	13.0	5	20.0	29	19.3
Master's degree	27	56.3	57	74.0	17	68.0	101	67.3
Doctoral degree	0	0.0	4	5.2	0	0.0	4	2.7
Other	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.7
No Response	7	14.6	5	6.5	3	12.0	15	10.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Within the Day group, almost all the S's and SA's hold at least master's degrees, while this is true for only 61% of the S(A)T's. Within the Residential group, around three-quarters of the SA's have at least master's degrees, while this is true for only 56% of the S's and 68% of the S(A)T's. For both groups the few doctorates earned tend to be held by Supervisor-administrators.

2. Numbers and types of degrees earned and being earned. Information on the highest degrees earned presents only a partial picture of the academic backgrounds of respondents, for a number of them have received more than one degree at the same level or are currently working on degrees. And one might also take into account those who hold coursework equivalents of academic degrees or special certification earned through academic coursework. Data for all these conditions are presented in Table 48.

Ninety-five percent of the Day respondents and 85% of the Residential respondents reported holding bachelor's degrees (once again noting the 10% of the Residential supervisors who did not answer item 3.1). Eighty-seven percent of the Day and 69% of the Residential respondents reported master's degrees, and it is interesting to note that 7 Day and 9 Residential persons reported two master's degrees and that one supervisor from each type of program reported three master's degrees. Seven Day and four Residential supervisors reported earning doctoral degrees. In addition to these academic degrees, 6 Day and 15 Residential persons reported "other" degrees, a category which includes item 3.1 responses which could not be "deciphered", those in which the degree earned was not clearly specified, and those in which the respondent indicated certification or degree equivalences. The percentages of respondents currently working on degrees are as follows: bachelor's degrees (Day 1%, Residential 0%); master's degrees (D 5%, R 7%); doctoral degrees (D 7%, R 4%); "Other" or unspecified degrees (D 7%, R 5%). It is interesting to note the variety of supervisor-types currently engaged in doctoral work: within the Day group, 2 S's, 4 SA's, and 1 S(A)T, and within the Residential group, 3 SA's and 3 S(A)T's.

3. Major areas of academic work at various levels. Another facet of degree work is the major areas of concentration or subject areas in which this work was done. Some of the areas most frequently given by the respondents are listed in Table 49. The relatively large percentages in the "Other" categories (particularly at the bachelor's and master's levels) represent respondents with somewhat unique majors (e.g., home economics; business administration; music; theology) and those with double majors (e.g., English and history; history and physical education). The only exceptions to this latter category who were not listed as "Others" were double-majors in which "education of the deaf" was one component. These were included under the single category "education of the deaf."

Table 48. Numbers and types of degrees earned and being earned

		Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
		No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
		Day respondents							
Earned degrees									
Bachelor's:	One	24	96.0	55	91.7	21	91.3	100	92.6
	Two	1	4.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	3	2.8
Master's:	One	22	88.0	52	86.7	13	56.5	87	80.6
	Two	1	4.0	5	8.3	1	4.3	7	6.5
	Three	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
Doctoral:	One	2	8.0	5	8.3	0	0.0	7	6.5
Other:	One	3	12.0	2	3.3	1	4.3	6	5.6
No Response		0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	1	0.9
Degrees being earned									
Bachelor's		0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	1	0.9
Master's		3	12.0	0	0.0	2	8.7	5	4.6
Doctoral		2	8.0	4	6.7	1	4.3	7	6.5
Other		0	0.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	3	2.8
No Response**		2	8.0	2	3.3	1	4.3	5	4.6
Totals***		25		60		23		108	
		Residential respondents							
Earned degrees									
Bachelor's:	One	40	83.3	66	85.7	21	84.0	127	84.7
	Two	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	1	0.7
Master's:	One	27	56.3	51	66.2	16	64.0	94	62.7
	Two	0	0.0	8	10.4	1	4.0	9	6.0
	Three	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.7
Doctoral:	One	0	0.0	4	5.2	0	0.0	4	2.7
Other:	One	2	4.2	8	10.4	5	20.0	15	10.0
No Response		7	14.6	5	6.5	3	12.0	15	10.0
Degrees being earned									
Bachelor's		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Master's		5	10.4	3	3.9	3	12.0	11	7.3
Doctoral		0	0.0	3	3.9	3	12.0	6	4.0
Other		0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	2	1.3
No Response**		2	4.2	4	5.2	0	0.0	6	4.0
Totals***		48		77		25		150	

* Percentages of total supervisors in category (e.g., Day Group S: 25; etc.)

** No Response: type of degree being earned was not indicated

***Totals: total number of supervisors in the particular category. There may be more than one response per supervisor

Table 49. Major areas of academic work at various levels

	Day respondents				Residential respondents			
Groups:	S	SA	S(A)T	Total	S	SA	S(A)T	Total
Bachelor's degree								
Ed. of the deaf	7	3	4	14	1	5	0	6
Special education	0	4	0	4	0	1	0	1
General education	6	18	4	28	12	18	8	38
Speech correction	1	3	2	6	1	1	0	2
Speech, English	6	9	0	15	5	6	1	12
Social sciences	1	10	1	12	3	9	1	13
Science; math.	1	1	0	2	2	5	2	9
Other	4	7	8	19	12	15	11	38
No Response*	0	4	2	6	4	6	0	10
Totals	26	59	21	106	40	66	23	129
Master's degrees								
Ed. of the deaf	7	13	9	29	8	29	7	44
Special education	2	7	0	9	3	8	1	12
General education	0	11	2	13	8	9	4	21
Ed. administration	2	8	3	13	2	7	0	9
Ed. psychology	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	1
Audiol.; sp. corr.	12	11	1	24	1	4	1	6
English	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Social sciences	0	3	0	3	1	4	1	6
Other	1	7	0	8	3	6	2	11
No Response*	0	3	0	3	1	2	0	3
Totals	24	65	15	104	27	70	18	115
Doctoral degrees								
Ed. of the deaf	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	1
Special education	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
General education	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Ed. administration	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Audiol.; sp. corr.	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response*	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Totals	2	5	0	7	0	4	0	4
Other degrees								
Ed. of deaf	3	1	1	5	0	4	3	7
General education	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Ed. administration	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Other	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	6
No Response*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	3	2	1	6	2	8	5	15
Degree currently sought								
Ed. of the deaf	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
Special education	1	3	0	4	2	0	2	4
General education	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2
Ed. administration	1	1	0	2	0	3	0	3
Ed. psychology	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Other	2	3	3	8	2	0	2	4
No Response*	2	2	1	5	2	5	0	7
Totals	7	9	5	21	7	10	8	25
Total respondents	25	60	23	108	48	77	25	150

*No Response: major area of degree was not indicated

The area categories of major relevance to supervisors in this study are "education of the deaf" and perhaps "special education", since this may in some cases be the official degree area under which work in the area of the deaf is included. The summary table below presents academic work done in these areas at various levels.

	Day respondents (N108)				Residential respondents (N150)			
	Ed. of Deaf		Special Ed.		Ed. of Deaf		Special Ed.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bachelor's degree	14	13	4	4	6	4	1	1
Master's degrees	29	27	9	8	44	29	12	8
Doctoral degrees	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
Other degrees	5	5	0	0	7	5	1	1
Degrees sought	0	0	4	4	4	3	4	3
Totals	50	47	18	17	62	42	18	13

Two cautions should be noted in interpreting these figures. First, there is the possibility of overlap in degree areas, as in the case of some respondents who may have received bachelor's degrees in "education of the deaf" and gone on to master's work in the same area or in "special education." Second, this listing does not include persons who have taken non-degree coursework, occasionally quite extensive coursework, in education of the deaf. (This type of work is covered in questionnaire item 3.3 and is discussed in the next section.) Nevertheless, it is rather surprising to find that only 50 (approximately 47%) of the Day supervisors and 62 (42%) of the Residential supervisors reported academic degree work in education of the deaf. Even when work in the area of special education is included, these figures are raised to only 68 (64%) and 80 (55%) respectively for the two groups.

Partial explanations may be found for the relatively low percentages just cited. In view of the many Day supervisors who work in small programs and are also responsible for supervising teachers of non-deaf handicapped and non-handicapped children, it is almost to be expected that a large proportion would not have had degree work specifically in the area of the deaf. One may note in Table 49, however, the large number of degrees in related areas, such as audiology and speech correction (31) and general education (43). If major areas of knowledge such as these were supplemented by non-degree coursework or degree-courses (e.g., electives) in education of the deaf, as might well be the case in some instances, at least a modicum of supervisory proficiency might be attained for working with these teachers. The paucity of degrees in education of the deaf is more difficult to explain for the Residential group, for most of these people work exclusively with teachers of the deaf. The large number of degrees in general education (63) and academic areas such as English, Social Sciences, and the like, leads one to believe that many of these persons gained their knowledge of work with the deaf through supplementary coursework or through actual on-the-job experience with the deaf.

Certain other patterns are prominent in Table 49. It may be noted, for example, that more respondents received training in education of the deaf at the master's level (Day 27%, Residential 29%) rather than at the bachelor's level (D 13%, R 4%). Also quite evident is the variety of undergraduate backgrounds these persons possess -- the vast majority in fact list majors in general education or in areas generally considered as belonging to the liberal arts and sciences. This diversity is less apparent at the master's level, which is predominantly devoted to the areas of education of the deaf, general education and education-related areas, and, for the Day respondents, audiology and speech correction. At the doctoral level and in the categories "Other degrees" and "Degrees currently sought", the major areas of study are almost exclusively concerned with education of the deaf and other educational majors.

4. Non-degree coursework. Courses not counting toward an academic degree can and often do account for a significant portion of an educator's professional background. In addition, the type and amount of this non-degree work can in some cases serve as an indication of professional activity. Questionnaire item 3.3 asked: "please indicate courses (credit and non-credit) taken outside of work on a degree in the past 10 years" and provided a check-space for "None" as well as seven blank spaces for course listings. Many respondents did list specific courses, and it is unfortunate that space does not permit discussion of those in this report. However, the numbers of courses taken are presented in Table 50.

Total Day and total Residential groups are remarkably similar in their responses. Using approximate percentages, one can say that 20% of the respondents indicated no non-degree coursework; 30% listed 1 - 4 courses; 20% listed 5 - 9; less than 5% listed 10 or more courses; and 15% gave "other" types of responses, (i.e., reporting coursework in terms of credit hours or types of study done). Around 10% of the respondents did not answer this item. Day and Residential supervisor-type subgroups also adhere fairly closely to

Table 50. Number of courses (credit and non-credit) taken outside of degree work during the past ten years

	Group S No.	Group S %	Group SA No.	Group SA %	Group S(A)T No.	Group S(A)T %	Total No.	Total %
	Day respondents							
1 - 4 courses	10	40.0	16	26.7	7	30.4	33	30.6
5 - 9 courses	5	20.0	12	20.0	8	34.8	25	23.1
10 or more courses	1	4.0	2	3.3	1	4.3	4	3.7
Other Response	2	8.0	12	20.0	2	8.7	16	14.8
No Courses	2	8.0	13	21.7	4	17.4	19	17.6
No Response	5	20.0	5	8.3	1	4.3	11	10.2
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
1 - 4 courses	14	29.2	23	29.9	10	40.0	47	31.3
5 - 9 courses	13	27.1	11	14.3	5	20.0	29	19.3
10 or more courses	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.7
Other Response	8	16.7	12	15.6	1	4.0	21	14.0
No Courses	8	16.7	21	27.3	6	24.0	35	23.3
No Response	5	10.4	9	11.7	3	12.0	17	11.3
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

these figures, with differences of 10% or more occurring only in the Day S subgroup (1 - 4 courses, 40%; No Response, 20%); the Day S(A)T subgroup (5 - 9 courses, 35%); and the Residential S(A)T subgroup (1 - 4 courses, 40%; "other" response, 4%).

The "other" responses to this item are interesting in themselves, for they display a diversity of areas and in some instances give an indication of the vast amount of non-degree coursework undertaken by many of the respondents. A few typical responses are given verbatim below.

> Five courses, a workshop, and a Fulbright study grant to the University of Manchester, England
> 2 year teacher training course
> 30 hours of work required to obtain an administrative credential
> 36 hours of graduate work in administration and supervision of a school for the deaf
> 30 semester hours beyond M.A. in speech correction and deaf education

Required subjects to teach the deaf
Related courses every other year
Summer institute, 9 hours, Disadvantaged Child
Language for the deaf
Many courses in reading and in linguistics

It may be noted that quite a few respondents indicated coursework related to education of the deaf. For some this was undoubtedly additional work done to supplement degrees already held in this area. For others these courses may have served as basic work in techniques of teaching deaf children.

C. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1. Experience teaching the deaf. Questionnaire item 3.5 requested information concerning the respondent's number of years experience as a teacher of the deaf, including breakdowns by full-time and part-time teaching and with or without supervisory responsibility. Since relatively few respondents reported part-time teaching and since supervisory experience is considered in another section and may be considered an "unknown" factor in its affect on amount or type of teaching experience, for this analysis all four responses (number of years) to this item were totaled to arrive at a figure representing "total years of teaching experience." Data are presented in Table 51.

Three things emerge quite clearly from the "Total" column of Table 51. One is the great similarity in number of years of experience of total Day and total Residential supervisors in the five categories ranging from "up to 4 years" to "20 - 24 years." Another is the large percentage of Residential respondents who have taught the deaf 25 years or more: 16% fit into this category as compared to only 3% for the Day group. This may be related to the previous finding that Residential respondents as a group are older than Day respondents. The third significant finding is that 30 of the Day supervisors (28%), 24 of them in the Supervisor-administrator category, indicate no experience in teaching the deaf.

Within the Day group, Supervisors-only (S) and Supervisor-teachers (S(A)T) are quite similar in number of years teaching experience. Around one-third reported less than 10 years experience, over one-third reported 10 - 19 years, and 4% (S) and 15% (S(A)T) reported more than 20 years experience. The remainder reported no experience (S 16%, S(A)T 9%) or did

Table 51. Total number of years experience as a teacher of the deaf

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
None	4	16.0	24	40.0	2	8.7	30	27.8
Up to 4 years	2	8.0	7	11.7	2	8.7	11	10.2
5 - 9 years	6	24.0	14	23.3	7	30.4	27	25.0
10 - 14 years	7	28.0	6	10.0	5	21.7	18	16.7
15 - 19 years	3	12.0	3	5.0	3	13.0	9	8.3
20 - 24 years	1	4.0	2	3.3	2	8.7	5	4.6
25 years or more	0	0.0	1	1.7	2	8.7	3	2.8
No Response	2	8.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	5	4.6
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
None	0	0.0	3	3.9	0	0.0	3	2.0
Up to 4 years	3	6.3	15	19.5	1	4.0	19	12.7
5 - 9 years	6	12.5	24	31.2	5	20.0	35	23.3
10 - 14 years	9	18.8	17	22.1	5	20.0	31	20.7
15 - 19 years	12	25.0	7	9.1	3	12.0	22	14.7
20 - 24 years	6	12.5	1	1.3	2	8.0	9	6.0
25 years or more	8	16.7	7	9.2	9	36.0	24	16.0
No Response	4	8.3	3	3.9	0	0.0	7	4.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

not respond to this item. Day Supervisor-administrators (SA) are similar in the category "less than 10 years experience", but differ in that many reported no experience and very few reported 10 years or more. There is less consistency among the Residential subgroups. Percentages for the combined categories are: up to 9 years experience, S 19%, SA 51%, S(A)T 24%; 10- 19 years experience, S 44%, SA 31%, S(A)T 32%; and 20 years or more, S 29%, SA 11%, S(A)T 44%.

Within both Day and Residential groups, Supervisor-teachers appear to have the largest number of years of teaching experience, followed by the Supervisors-only, with slightly less experience, and the Supervisor-administrators, who tend to have far less classroom experience.

2. Types of teaching experience with the deaf. In order to explore further the types of classroom experience with the deaf, questionnaire items 3.6 to 3.8 requested information on ages taught, subjects taught, and types of classes in which the respondents had taught.

Table 52 shows that 64 Day supervisors have taught in self-contained classrooms. This number represents 59% of the total Day group or 88% of the 73 Day supervisors who indicated some teaching experience as discussed in the previous section. Of the Residential respondents, 111 reported working in a self-contained classroom, representing 74% of the total group or 79% of those with reported teaching experience.

Table 52. Types of teaching experience with the deaf

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Self-contained Classroom	17	68.0	27	45.0	20	87.0	64	59.3
Specific subjects or Resource Teacher	13	52.0	21	35.0	13	12.0	47	43.5
No Teaching	4	16.0	24	40.0	2	8.7	30	27.8
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Self-contained Classroom	38	79.2	54	70.1	19	76.0	111	74.0
Specific subjects or Resource Teacher	25	52.1	59	76.6	16	64.0	100	66.7
No Teaching	0	0.0	3	3.9	0	0.0	3	2.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*There may be more than one answer per respondent

When asked whether they had served as either special teachers, specific subject matter teachers, or resource teachers for deaf children, 44% of the Day respondents replied affirmatively (S 52%, SA 35%, S(A)T 12%) as did 67% of the Residential respondents (S 52%, SA 77%, S(A)T 64%).

Table 53 reports the ages of children with whom respondents have had teaching experience. The percentages used in this table represent percentages of totals for the category types (S, SA, S(A)T, Total) as in all previous tables. However, as already mentioned, 30 Day and 3 Residential respondents reported no teaching experience. Therefore, for a more meaningful accounting of ages taught, one might base these percentages instead on

Table 53. Ages of deaf children taught

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
3 or younger	11	44.0	18	30.0	11	47.8	40	37.0
4, 5 yrs. old	12	48.0	22	36.7	13	56.5	47	43.5
6,7,8 yrs. old	16	64.0	23	38.3	18	78.3	57	52.8
9,10,11 yrs. old	18	72.0	16	26.7	18	78.3	52	48.1
12,13,14 yrs. old	18	72.0	21	35.0	14	60.9	53	49.1
15,16,17 yrs. old	10	40.0	20	33.3	11	47.8	41	38.0
18 or older	4	16.0	8	13.3	7	30.4	19	17.6
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Teaching	4	16.0	24	40.0	2	8.7	30	27.8
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
3 or younger	8	16.7	13	16.9	7	28.0	28	18.7
4, 5 yrs. old	18	37.5	22	28.6	10	40.0	50	33.3
6,7,8 yrs. old	34	70.8	36	46.8	16	64.0	86	57.3
9,10,11 yrs. old	34	70.8	53	68.8	20	80.0	107	71.3
12,13,14 yrs. old	34	70.8	61	79.2	22	88.0	117	78.0
15,16,17 yrs. old	28	58.3	64	83.1	17	68.0	109	72.7
18 or older	22	45.8	52	67.5	16	64.0	90	60.0
No Response	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.7
No Teaching	0	0.0	3	3.9	0	0.0	3	2.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*There may be more than one answer per respondent

the totals of respondents who have had teaching experience (Day N78, Residential N147). When this is done, the following percentages result.

Ages of children taught	Total Day respondents with teaching experience		Total Residential respondents with teaching experience	
	No.	%	No.	%
3 or younger	40	51.3	28	19.0
4, 5, yrs. old	47	60.3	50	34.0
6, 7, 8 yrs. old	57	73.1	86	58.5
9, 10, 11 yrs. old	52	66.7	107	72.8
12, 13, 14 yrs. old	53	67.9	117	79.6
15, 16, 17 yrs. old	41	52.6	109	74.1
18 or older	19	24.4	90	61.2
No Response	0	0.0	1	0.7
Totals	78		147	

From this abbreviated table it can be seen a) that significantly larger percentages of Day respondents with teaching experience have worked with children of up to 5 years of age; b) that a somewhat larger percentage of Day respondents have worked with the 6, 7, 8 year old age group; c) that the Day and Residential groups are fairly similar for the 9, 10, 11 year old age group; and d) that Residential respondent percentages are much larger for ages 15 and over.

Within the Day group, at least 60% of the supervisors reported teaching experience with children 4 to 14 years of age, slightly over half with children 3 or younger and 15 to 17, and only 24% with children 18 or older. For the Residential group, around 75% reported teaching experience with children from 9 to 17 years of age, about 60% with children 6 to 8 and 18 or older, 34% with children 4 - 5 years old, and 19% with children 3 or younger.

3. Teaching experience with non-deaf children. In questionnaire item 3.9 supervisors were asked about teaching experience with types of children besides the deaf. As shown in Table 54, 57% of the Day and 25% of the Residential respondents reported experience teaching non-deaf handicapped children. The figures for work with non-handicapped children are Day 72% and Residential 41%.

Table 54. Experience teaching non-deaf handicapped children and non-handicapped children

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Experience teaching non-deaf handicapped	18	72.0	31	51.7	13	56.5	62	57.4
Experience teaching non-handicapped	15	60.0	49	81.7	14	60.9	78	72.2
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Experience teaching non-deaf handicapped	12	25.0	21	27.3	4	16.0	37	24.7
Experience teaching non-handicapped	20	41.7	32	41.6	9	36.0	61	40.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*There may be more than one answer per respondent

4. Supervisory experience in programs for the deaf. Questionnaire item 3.4 requested information concerning number of years of supervisory experience in programs for the deaf and further broke this information down into part- and full-time positions and work in the "present program" and in other programs. For this report only the total number of years of experience are used, regardless of the other factors. The results are presented in Table 55.

Table 55. Total number of years engaged in supervisory work in programs for the deaf

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Up to 4 years	9	36.0	16	26.7	14	60.9	39	36.1
5 - 9 years	7	28.0	22	36.7	5	21.7	34	31.5
10 - 14 years	4	16.0	9	15.0	2	8.7	15	13.9
15 - 19 years	3	12.0	5	8.3	0	0.0	8	7.4
20 - 24 years	1	4.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	4	3.7
25 years or more	0	0.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	3	2.8
No Response	1	4.0	2	3.3	2	8.7	5	4.6
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Up to 4 years	13	27.1	21	27.3	6	24.0	40	26.7
5 - 9 years	11	22.9	18	23.4	8	32.0	37	24.7
10 - 14 years	8	16.7	20	26.0	5	20.0	33	22.0
15 - 19 years	9	18.8	5	6.5	1	4.0	15	10.0
20 - 24 years	1	2.1	8	10.4	1	4.0	10	6.7
25 years or more	5	10.4	4	5.2	1	4.0	10	6.7
No Response	1	2.1	1	1.3	3	12.0	5	3.3
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

For both total Day and total Residential groups, the largest percentages of respondents reported up to 4 years of supervisory experience (Day 36%, Residential 27%), with steadily declining percentages reporting in the other categories as number of years of experience increases. In comparing the two groups, Residential respondents as a group appear to have somewhat more experience than Day respondents (R 45% vs. D 28% in categories of 10 years or more experience).

Within the Day group, the Supervisor-teachers apparently have the least amount of supervisory experience (61% have 4 years or less), while the S and SA groups are more alike. Subgroup percentages within the Residential group are quite similar, although the Supervisor-only group seems to have slightly more experience than the other two subgroups.

5. Total years of supervisory and teaching experience with the deaf. In order to obtain an estimate of total years supervisory and teaching experience with the deaf, each respondent's reported numbers of years were added for items 3.4.1 - 3.4.4 and 3.5.2, thus avoiding duplicate tabulation of years when both supervision and teaching were done. The resulting figures, which may be interpreted as "total years of classroom-related experience with the deaf", are presented in Table 56.

Table 56. Total number of years experience supervising and/or teaching in programs for the deaf

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Up to 4 years	4	16.0	10	16.7	5	21.7	19	17.6
5 - 9 years	5	20.0	16	26.7	4	17.4	25	23.1
10 - 14 years	4	16.0	10	16.7	7	30.4	21	19.4
15 - 19 years	6	24.0	7	11.7	2	8.7	15	13.9
20 - 24 years	3	12.0	8	13.3	2	8.7	13	12.0
25 years or more	3	12.0	7	11.7	3	13.0	13	12.0
No Response	0	0.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	2	1.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Up to 4 years	2	4.2	2	2.6	0	0.0	4	2.7
5 - 9 years	3	6.3	11	14.3	5	20.0	19	12.7
10 - 14 years	6	12.5	17	22.1	4	16.0	27	18.0
15 - 19 years	4	8.3	17	22.1	5	20.0	26	17.3
20 - 24 years	4	8.3	8	10.4	2	8.0	14	9.3
25 years or more	28	58.3	21	27.3	9	36.0	58	38.7
No Response	1	2.1	1	1.3	0	0.0	2	1.3
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Total Day and total Residential groups are distributed quite similarly in categories covering 10 to 24 years of experience with the deaf (10 - 14 years, D 19%, R 18%; 15 - 19 years, D 14%, R 17%; 20 - 24 years, D 12%, R 9%). However, the two groups diverge quite sharply in categories representing fewer years experience, in which the Day respondents predominate (up to 4 years, D 18%, R 3%; 5 - 9 years, D 23%, R 13%) and in categories representing many years of experience, in which the Residential respondents predominate (D 12%, R 39%). These patterns may reflect age distributions of the two groups or other undetermined factors.

There are no strong subgroup patterns discernible within the Day group. For the Residential respondents, Supervisors-only appear to have the most years of experience.

D. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND AFFILIATIONS

1. Publications. One indication of an individual's professional activity is the number and types of publications which he produces. Since "type" of publication is difficult to evaluate in this type of survey (to say nothing of the relative significance of writings in terms of contribution to the profession or the public), this discussion will of necessity limit itself to the quantitative aspects of publications, with the realization that this is at best only a partial measure of the "professional-ness" of respondents' activity in this area.

Table 57 presents information on the numbers of articles published in professional journals (questionnaire item 3.12). Sixty-five percent of the Day and 53% of the Residential respondents report no such publications. For number groupings of articles, percentages are as follows: 1 - 2 articles, Day 14%, Residential 17%; 3 - 4 articles, D 5%, R 6%; 5 or more articles, D 1%, R 4%. Patterns among the Day subgroups correspond quite closely to those of the total group, and no subgroup shows a clear superiority in number of published articles. The same holds true for Residential subgroups.

Supervisors were also asked to indicate other publications, including "books, chapters, monographs, special reports, etc." (item 3.13). Fifty-eight percent of the Day and 47% of the Residential respondents reported no such publications. Affirmative responses fitted into the following categories: 1 - 2 publications, Day 20%, Residential 25%; 3 - 4 publications, D 1%, R 5%; 5 or more publications, D 0%, R 1%. No Responses were given by 17% of the Day and 20% of the Residential supervisors.

Table 57. Number of articles published in professional journals

	Group S No.	Group S %	Group SA No.	Group SA %	Group S(A)T No.	Group S(A)T %	Total No.	Total %
	Day respondents							
None	16	64.0	39	65.0	16	69.6	71	65.7
1 - 2 articles	2	8.0	9	15.0	4	17.4	15	13.9
3 - 4 articles	2	8.0	2	3.3	1	4.3	5	4.6
5 or more	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
Other	2	8.0	4	6.7	0	0.0	6	5.6
No Response	3	12.0	5	8.3	2	8.7	10	9.3
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
None	29	60.4	39	50.7	11	44.0	79	52.7
1 - 2 articles	9	18.8	11	14.3	6	24.0	26	17.3
3 - 4 articles	2	4.2	6	7.8	1	4.0	9	6.0
5 or more	0	0.0	5	6.5	1	4.0	6	4.0
Other	2	4.2	4	5.2	1	4.0	7	4.7
No Response	6	12.5	12	15.6	5	20.0	23	15.3
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

2. Attendance at professional conventions and meetings. Another indication of professional activity is attendance at professional conventions and meetings of various kinds. Questionnaire item 3.14 requested information on attendance and "participation" at such meetings for a six-year period (January, 1960 to December, 1966). While a great deal of information was obtained from responses to item 3.14, only one aspect is discussed here: types of conventions (national, regional, state) and sponsoring organizations (Table 58). It should be noted, moreover, that the affirmative responses for each sub-item recorded in this table represent attendance at one or more conventions of that type.

There are two categories with similar responses for both total Day and total Residential groups: Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf - Regional (Day 24%, Residential 25%) and Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf (D 18%, R 21%). However, the similarities are outweighed by the differences, which appear to reflect to some extent the backgrounds and types of positions of the respondents as well as the orientations of programs

Table 58. Attendance at professional conventions and meetings for the years 1960-1966

Note: Responses for each item below indicate "attendance at one or more of that type of convention"

Key: Internat'l Congress - International Congress on Education of the Deaf
A.G. Bell Ass'n - Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf
Conf. Executives - Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf
Amer. Instructors - American Instructors of the Deaf
A.S.H.A. - American Speech and Hearing Association
C.E.C. - Council for Exceptional Children

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
None attended	0	0.0	5	8.3	3	13.0	8	7.4
Internat'l Congress	10	40.0	15	25.0	6	26.1	31	28.7
A.G. Bell - National	8	32.0	13	21.7	11	47.8	32	29.6
A.G. Bell - Regional	4	16.0	16	26.7	6	26.1	26	24.1
Conf. Executives	6	24.0	12	20.0	1	4.3	19	17.6
Amer. Instructors	8	32.0	17	28.3	9	39.1	34	31.5
A.S.H.A. - National	12	48.0	16	26.7	8	34.8	36	33.3
C.E.C. - National	15	60.0	29	48.3	5	21.7	49	45.4
C.E.C. - State	14	68.0	35	58.3	9	39.1	61	56.5
Other	13	52.0	34	56.7	10	43.5	57	52.8
No Response	0	0.0	3	5.0	1	4.3	4	3.7
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
None attended	4	8.3	0	0.0	1	4.0	5	3.3
Internat'l Congress	19	39.6	41	53.2	11	44.0	71	47.3
A.G. Bell - National	18	37.5	30	39.0	13	52.0	61	40.7
A.G. Bell - Regional	15	31.3	16	20.8	6	24.0	37	24.7
Conf. Executives	2	4.2	25	32.5	5	20.0	32	21.3
Amer. Instructors	29	60.4	59	76.6	15	60.0	103	68.7
A.S.H.A. - National	0	0.0	14	18.2	2	8.0	16	10.7
C.E.C. - National	7	14.6	15	19.5	9	36.0	31	20.7
C.E.C. - State	19	39.6	31	40.3	5	20.0	55	36.7
Other	17	35.4	34	44.2	10	40.0	61	40.7
No Response	1	2.1	2	2.6	1	4.0	4	2.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*There may be more than one answer per respondent

in which they are employed. Thus, Day respondents, many of whom have "general special education" backgrounds and a large proportion of whom work in areas besides that of the deaf, responded more frequently than Residential respondents to: American Speech and Hearing Association (D 33%, R 11%), Council for Exceptional Children - National (D 45%, R 21%) and Council for Exceptional Children - State (D 57%, R 37%). The Residential respondents, on the other hand, revealed their strong orientation toward the specialty "education of the deaf" by responding more frequently to: American Instructors of the Deaf (D 32%, R 69%), International Congress on Education of the Deaf (D 29%, R 47%), and Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf - National (D 30%, R 41%).

3. Other professional activities. Questionnaire item 3.16 was intended to provide an indication of respondents' participation in various professional activities by using a one year sampling period--September 1964 through August, 1965. The major types of activities checked were: a) participation in workshops and conferences; b) major speaking engagements; c) membership on special committees or boards; and d) other activities. Many respondents wrote in somewhat detailed accounts of their activities on the questionnaire; others merely checked the spaced provided or gave minimal responses. In quantifying the data the most plausible recourse was to tabulate responses as "yes" or "no" ("some activities" or "none"), in essence interpreting each positive response as "one or more" workshops, speaking engagements, and so forth. These affirmative responses are presented in Table 59.

For total Day and total Residential groups, the response percentages are similar for the categories "workshops and conferences" (Day 56%, Residential 52%) and "other activities" -- those which did not fit under the headings given (D 13%, R 11%), and similar percentages did not respond to this item at all (D 25%, R 31%). However, somewhat larger percentages of Day supervisors indicated "membership on special committees or boards" (D 49%, R 28%) and "major speaking engagements" (D 41%, R 29%). It may be that the apparently greater amount of professional activity of Day respondents is related to their typical involvement in more than one area of education and to the opportunities for speaking engagements and committee memberships within large school systems and the urban centers in which these systems are generally located.

4. Professional affiliations. Questionnaire item 3.15 requested information concerning membership in "professional organizations concerned with education, work with the deaf, and related areas".

Table 59. Participation in professional activities during the period September, 1964, through August, 1965

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Workshops	16	64.0	33	55.0	11	47.8	60	55.6
Speaking	12	48.0	25	41.7	7	30.4	44	40.7
Committees	15	60.0	29	48.3	9	39.1	53	49.1
Other	2	8.0	10	16.7	2	8.7	14	13.0
No Response	4	16.0	15	25.0	8	34.8	27	25.0
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Workshops	22	45.8	47	61.0	9	36.0	78	52.0
Speaking	9	18.8	25	32.5	10	40.0	44	29.3
Committees	12	25.0	23	29.9	7	28.0	42	28.0
Other	7	14.6	8	10.4	2	8.0	17	11.3
No Response	17	35.4	20	26.0	9	36.0	46	30.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*There may be more than one answer per respondent

Table 60 reveals that Day and Residential supervisors show quite similar patterns in the number of national organizations to which they belong. The percentages are as follows: membership in no national organizations, Day 4%, Residential 1%; one organization, D 13%, R 16%; two, D 15%, R 27%; three, D 24%, R 23%; four, D 21%, R 19%; five, D 14%, R 7%; six or more, D 8%, R 6%. There is a slight tendency for Day supervisors to belong to more national organizations, but this tendency is less strong than might be expected for persons who typically work in areas besides education of the deaf. The possibility exists that structuring of the questionnaire response led some of these respondents to restrict themselves to national organizations concerned with education of the deaf.

Percentages for the Day subgroups tend to conform to those for the group as a whole, with the exception of Day S's, 40% of whom listed three organizations and Day S(A)T's, 35% of whom reported four. Within the Residential group group, the S and S(A)T subgroups are similar, but the Supervisor-administrators (SA) tend to list membership in more national organizations -- over 40% belong to four or more national groups.

Table 60. Number of national organizations of which supervisors are members

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
None	1	4.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	4	3.7
One	3	12.0	8	13.3	3	13.0	14	13.0
Two	3	12.0	11	18.3	2	8.7	16	14.8
Three	10	40.0	12	20.0	4	17.4	26	24.1
Four	4	16.0	11	18.3	8	34.8	23	21.3
Five	4	16.0	8	13.3	3	13.0	15	13.9
Six or more	0	0.0	6	10.0	3	13.0	9	8.3
No Response	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
None	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
One	8	16.7	12	15.6	4	16.0	24	16.0
Two	14	29.2	18	23.4	8	32.0	40	26.7
Three	14	29.2	13	16.9	7	28.0	34	22.7
Four	6	12.5	20	26.0	3	12.0	29	19.3
Five	4	8.3	6	7.8	1	4.0	11	7.3
Six or more	0	0.0	7	9.2	2	8.0	9	6.0
No Response	1	2.1	1	1.3	0	0.0	2	1.3
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Table 61 presents figures for membership in regional, state, and local professional organizations. Approximately one-third of the supervisors from both groups did not respond to this item, but for those who did the Day respondents appear to belong to more organizations than do the Residential supervisors (e.g., for three or more organizations the percentages are: Day 33%, Residential 8%). Thus, it might be that membership in regional, state, and local groups is a more accurate reflection of the Day respondents' diversity of professional involvement than is membership in national organizations.

If degrees of professional activity were being sought, simple membership in organizations would count less heavily than actual involvement in these organizations as indicated by participation in group activities, membership

Table 61. Number of regional, state, and local organizations (related to the education of the deaf, general education, and related areas) of which supervisors are members

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
None	1	4.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	4	3.7
One	3	12.0	9	15.0	3	13.0	15	13.9
Two	3	12.0	12	20.0	7	30.4	22	20.4
Three	3	12.0	10	16.7	5	21.7	18	16.7
Four	2	8.0	4	6.7	0	0.0	6	5.6
Five or more	5	20.0	3	5.0	3	13.0	11	10.2
No Response	8	32.0	19	31.7	5	21.7	32	29.6
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
None	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
One	16	33.3	26	33.8	6	24.0	48	32.0
Two	10	20.8	23	29.9	4	16.0	37	24.7
Three	3	6.3	3	3.9	2	8.0	8	5.3
Four	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.3
Five or more	0	0.0	2	2.6	0	0.0	2	1.3
No Response	16	33.3	23	29.9	13	52.0	52	34.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

on boards and committees, and offices held. Respondents were thus asked to indicate whether they served in any official capacity for organizations which they had listed. For national organizations the figures and percentages were as follows: one office held (Day 9%, Residential 7%); two offices held (D 5%, R 1%); three or more offices (D 0%, R 1%). For regional, state, and local organizations the figures and percentages were: one office (D 20%, R 13%); two offices (D 4%, R 2%); three or more offices (D 3%, R 1%). For both Day and Residential groups, Supervisor-administrators tended to predominate in holding official positions.

Item 3.15 listed six national organizations with which supervisors of the deaf might be expected to be affiliated -- three of these primarily concerned with education of the deaf, the others devoted to speech and hearing, to the broad area of special education, and to general education. Percentages reporting membership in these organizations are as follows (Table 62):

Table 62. National organizations of
which supervisors are members

Key: A.G. Bell Assn - Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf
Conf. Executives - Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf
Amer. Instructors - American Instructors of the Deaf
A.S.H.A. - American Speech and Hearing Association
N.E.A. - National Education Association
C.E.C. - Council for Exceptional Children

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
None	1	4.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	4	3.7
A.G. Bell Ass'n	13	52.0	31	51.7	21	91.3	65	60.2
Conf. Executives	5	20.0	17	28.3	4	17.4	26	24.1
Amer. Instructors	12	48.0	24	40.0	16	69.6	52	48.1
A.S.H.A.	13	52.0	17	28.3	6	26.1	36	33.3
C.E.C.	16	64.0	40	66.7	18	78.3	74	68.5
N.E.A.	12	48.0	30	50.0	12	52.2	54	50.0
No Response	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
None	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
A.G. Bell Ass'n	27	56.3	44	57.1	13	52.0	84	56.0
Conf. Executives	8	16.7	34	44.2	10	40.0	52	34.7
Amer. Instructors	45	93.8	73	94.8	22	88.0	140	93.3
A.S.H.A.	3	6.3	15	19.5	4	16.0	22	14.7
C.E.C.	20	41.7	33	42.9	8	32.0	61	40.7
N.E.A.	11	22.9	20	26.0	5	20.0	36	24.0
No Response	1	2.1	1	1.3	0	0.0	2	1.3
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

* There may be more than one answer per respondent

Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf (Day 60%, Residential 56%); Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf (D 24%, R 35%); American Instructors of the Deaf (D 48%, R 93%); American Speech and Hearing Association (D 33%, R 15%); Council for Exceptional Children (D 69%, R 41%); and the National Education Association (D 50%, R 24%). These figures are interesting in their reflection of the supervisors' professional interests, their professional backgrounds, and also the types of positions in which they are employed.

5. Certification. Various types of professional certification are available for persons engaged in work related to education of the deaf. Questionnaire items 3.17, 3.18, and 3.19 covered three certifying groups, and the supervisors' responses are presented in Table 63.

It can be seen that most of the Residential respondents (77%) have some sort of state certification, as do almost all of the Day respondents (94%). There was a large variety of types of state certification reported, including certifications for various levels of teaching and various types of teaching, as well as special certifications for supervisory and administrative positions. In addition, many of the respondents reported holding two or more state certifications. The picture is more clear-cut for certification by professional organizations. Twenty-six percent of the Day group and 11% of the Residential group are certified by the American Speech and Hearing Association. The percentages for certification by the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf are 34% for Day supervisors and 81% for the Residential supervisors.

Table 63. Professional certification

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
Certified by:	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
Conference of Executives of Amer. Schools for the Deaf	8	32.0	19	31.7	10	43.5	37	34.3
American Speech and Hearing Association	11	44.0	12	20.0	5	21.7	28	26.0
State	25	100.0	55	91.7	21	91.3	101	93.5
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
Conference of Executives of Amer. Schools for the Deaf	38	79.2	64	83.1	19	76.0	121	80.7
American Speech and Hearing Association	3	6.3	10	13.0	3	12.0	16	10.7
State	38	79.2	60	77.9	17	68.0	115	76.7
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*There may be more than one answer per respondent

VIII. GRADUATE PROGRAMS FOR SUPERVISORS

The introduction to section 5. of the questionnaire explained that some thought was being given to establishing graduate programs for supervisors of teachers of the deaf. The fact that all of the respondents were currently engaged in this type of work presented a unique opportunity to obtain the opinions of these experienced persons concerning the nature of these planned programs. Consequently, the supervisor-respondents were asked to evaluate and comment on various types of programs, coursework, and experiences for supervisor preparation programs and also for advanced study programs for current supervisors of teachers of the deaf.

A. SUPERVISOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS FOR EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

Questionnaire items 5.1 to 5.5 focused on the nature of supervisor preparation programs for individuals "...who have taught the deaf (at various levels) and have above-average teaching ability, leadership potential, and the ability to get along with others".

1. Teaching experience. Respondents were asked to judge the minimum number of years of actual classroom experience a person should have before becoming a supervisor of teachers of the deaf. The results are shown in Table 64.

The majority of Day and Residential respondents believed that 4 to 6 years was the minimal amount of teaching experience necessary (Day 57%, Residential 58%). The two groups differed, however, in that Day respondents tended to approve of lesser amounts of experience (1 to 3 years: D 18%, R 6%) while Residential respondents favored greater amounts (7 - 9 years: D 12%, R 17%; 10 years or more: D 9%, R 36%). In fact, 19% of the Residential respondents felt that at least 10 years of experience was needed. It is interesting to speculate on the possible relationship between responses to this item and data on the respondents' own number of years of teaching experience (Table 51), which revealed that Day supervisors as a group had fewer years of teaching experience than did the Residential supervisors.

2. Types of supervisor preparation programs. Questionnaire item 5.4 asked "how important do you think graduate programs of various kinds would be in preparing teachers of the deaf to become supervisors?". Respondents were asked to rate each of five types of programs using a 5-point scale (4:

Table 64. Minimum years of classroom experience considered necessary by respondents for an individual to become a supervisor of teachers of the deaf

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
No Experience	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1 - 3 years	6	24.0	8	13.3	5	21.7	19	17.6
4 - 6 years	15	60.0	36	60.0	11	47.8	62	57.4
7 - 9 years	2	8.0	6	10.0	5	21.7	13	12.0
10-12 years	2	8.0	5	8.3	2	8.7	9	8.3
13-15 years	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
16 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Response	0	0.0	4	6.6	0	0.0	4	3.7
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
No Experience	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1 - 3 years	4	8.3	3	3.9	2	8.0	9	6.0
4 - 6 years	24	50.0	54	70.1	9	36.0	87	58.0
7 - 9 years	11	22.9	10	13.0	5	20.0	26	17.3
10-12 years	9	18.8	10	13.0	7	28.0	26	17.3
13-15 years	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
16 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	2	1.3
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

very important; 3: important; 2: less important; 1: not important; 0: undecided, no opinion). A blank was also provided for additional responses.

Data for this item (and succeeding items which use these ratings) were initially tabulated in the same format used in previous chapters. A section of the table for item 5.4 is shown below.

		Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Type of Program	Rating	Day respondents							
Doctoral program	4	7	28	6	10	3	13	16	15
	3	3	12	10	17	4	17	17	16
	2	4	16	21	35	4	17	29	27
	1	4	16	15	25	4	17	23	21
	0	7	28	8	13	8	35	23	21
Master's program	4	14	56	25	42	9	39	48	44
	3	4	16	16	27	8	35	28	26
	2	3	12	5	8	3	13	11	10
	1	1	4	3	5	0	0	4	4
	0	3	12	11	18	3	13	17	16

In this table, the "0" rating has been used not only for "no opinion", "undecided" responses, but also for "other responses" (comments written in and uncodable responses, such as check-marks and numbers over 4) and "no responses" (sub-items left blank). The latter account for the majority of the (non-)responses in the "0" category.

To facilitate interpretation of these strings of numbers and percentages, single-number "rating scores" were calculated for group and subgroup responses to each sub-item. To do this, percentages were given weightings corresponding to the rating numerals and then added to achieve rating scores. For example, scores for the Day S subgroup on the sub-items "Doctoral program" and "Master's program" were computed in the following way.

		Group S		Weighting (rating times percentage)	Rating Score
		No.	%		
Type of Program	Rating	Day resp.			
Doctoral program	4	7	28	4 x 28 = 112	196
	3	3	12	3 x 12 = 36	
	2	4	16	2 x 16 = 32	
	1	4	16	1 x 16 = 16	
	0	7	28	0 x 28 = 0	
				total: 196	
Master's program	4	14	56	4 x 56 = 224	300
	3	4	16	3 x 16 = 48	
	2	3	12	2 x 12 = 24	
	1	1	4	1 x 4 = 4	
	0	3	12	0 x 12 = 0	
				total: 300	

By using rating scores, the portion of the item 5.4 table shown above can be reduced to the following:

	Day respondents			
	S	SA	S(A)T	Total
Doctoral programs	196	186	154	183
Master's programs	300	270	211	276

These rating scales may be viewed as reflecting the importance attached to various sub-items by Day and Residential groups and subgroups as follows:

Rating Score	Interpretation
400	Very important; the highest score possible, indicating that 100% of the respondents rated the sub-item as "4: very important".
300	Important
200	Less important
100	Not important
0	100% lack of response, "other" response, or "undecided, no opinion"

Such literal interpretation of the scores depends to a great extent on the number of supervisors who responded to the sub-items. Since in many cases the "no response" rates were quite high, perhaps the greatest usefulness of the rating scores is that they make possible "relative interpretations", such as rankings of the sub-items.

The complete tabulation of ratings for types of programs is contained in Appendix C, Table C1. Rating scores and rank orderings of program types are presented in Table 65.

Table 65. Rating scores and rankings for various types of supervisor preparation programs (highest possible rating score is 400)

Note: Doctoral: A doctoral (Ph.D. or Ed.D) program
Post-Master's: One year of work beyond the master's level
Master's: A master's degree
One year: A one year program (with 1 or 2 summer sessions)
Summers: A series of summer sessions and workshops

Rank	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total Group	
	Day respondents							
1	Master's	300	Post-Master's	290	Master's	278	Master's	278
2	Post-Master's	296	Master's	270	Post-Master's	211	Post-Master's	276
3	Doctoral	196	One Year	227	Doctoral	154	One Year	200
4	One Year	144	Summer	222	Summer	152	Doctoral	183
5	Summer	124	Doctoral	186	One Year	143	Summer	169
	Residential respondents							
1	Master's	283	Master's	272	Master's	272	Master's	277
2	One year	237	Post-Master's	249	Summer	260	Post-Master's	243
3	Post-Master's	230	Summer	207	Post-Master's	244	One Year	214
4	Summer	177	One Year	197	One Year	224	Summer	206
5	Doctoral	152	Doctoral	163	Doctoral	148	Doctoral	158

Table 65 shows that for both Day and Residential groups Master's degree programs rank highest in importance (D 278, R 277) for supervisor preparation, followed by Post-master's programs (D 276, R 243), and One year programs (D 200, R 214). For the Day group Doctoral programs (183) rank fourth and Summer session and workshop programs (169) fifth. These rankings are reversed for the Residential group: Summer session (206); Doctoral programs (158).

Within the Day group, the Master's and Post-master's programs were considered most important by all three subgroups (S, SA, S(A)T), but the rankings of the other types of programs vary. All three Residential subgroups ranked Master's programs as most important and Doctoral programs as least important, with much variation in the subgroup rankings of other types of programs.

The supervisors were also asked whether they thought that non-doctoral supervisor preparation programs should lead to some sort of special certification (item 5.5). Table 66 shows that the responses of total Day and Residential groups were remarkably similar: approximately two-thirds checked "Yes"; slightly less than a third were "Undecided"; and less than 3% responded "No.".

Table 66. Supervisors' opinions on whether a non-doctoral supervisor training program should lead to some sort of special certification

	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Day respondents							
No	1	4.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	3	2.8
Yes	18	72.0	37	61.7	17	73.9	72	66.7
Undecided	5	20.0	20	33.3	6	26.1	31	28.7
Other response	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
No response	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
Totals*	25		60		23		108	
	Residential respondents							
No	1	2.1	2	2.6	0	0.0	3	2.0
Yes	35	72.9	45	58.4	17	68.0	97	64.7
Undecided	11	22.9	26	33.8	8	32.0	45	30.0
Other response	0	0.0	2	2.6	0	0.0	2	1.3
No response	1	2.1	2	2.6	0	0.0	3	2.0
Totals*	48		77		25		150	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

3. Graduate courses for supervisor preparation programs. Questionnaire item 5.2 presented a list of 17 courses which might typically be included in a graduate program "...for an experienced teacher of the deaf who would like to become a supervisor". Supervisors were asked to rate each of the courses using the scale previously discussed -- from 4 (very important) to 0 (undecided). Since this listing is not comprehensive and may have omitted courses considered important by the respondents, spaces were also provided for course titles to be written in.

A full tabulation of responses to this item is contained in Tables C2 and C3 of Appendix C. Table 67 presents a listing of the courses grouped by major areas (they were presented in a random order in the questionnaire) together with their rankings for various groups and subgroups. Table 68 lists the courses according to rankings for the groups and also presents rating scores (discussed in the previous section) to give a further idea of the relative importance attached to various courses by the respondents.

Course rankings by total Day and Residential groups are remarkably similar. Courses considered most important for supervisor preparation programs (courses with rating scores of over 300, indicating ratings from "important" to "very important") include: "Supervision" (Day 328, Residential 354); "Curriculum theory and development" (D 323, R 335); "Child development; child psychology" (D 327, R 329); "Learning disabilities: diagnosis and remediation" (D 325, R 325); "Reading" (D 307, R 342); and, with slightly lower ratings, "Guidance and counseling" (D 296, R 311) and "Speech and hearing science" (D 311, R 278). Courses considered less useful (with rating scores from 200, "less important", to 300, "important") are: "Recent research in special education" (D 291, R 285); "Education of disturbed and conduct-problem children" (D261, R 286); "Psycho-social problems of exceptional children" (D 280, R 264); "Administration" (D 259, R 277); "Educational and psychological measurement" (D 254, R 277); "Linguistics; psycholinguistics" (D 265, R 237); and "Psychology and education of the mentally retarded" (D 216, R 263). Courses considered of least importance are: "Clinical audiometry" (D 238, R 217); "Research techniques and statistics" (D 216, R 209); and "Psychology and education of the gifted" (D 157, R 189).

Table 67. Courses for supervisor preparation programs: groupings by major areas and rankings of courses for various groups

	Day Respondents				Residential Respondents				Day and Resid.
	S	SA	SAT	Total	S	SA	SAT	Total	
Special Education									
Recent research in special education	5	9	7	8	9	8	8	8	8
Psycho-social problems of exceptional children	10	8	9	9	12	11	12.5	12	10
Learning Disabilities: diagnosis and remediation	3	3.5	4	3	4	5	4	5	4
Education of disturbed and conduct-problem children	14	10	12	11	7	9	8	7	9
Psychology and education of the mentally retarded	16	16	15	15.5	11	13	12.5	13	14
Psychology and education of the gifted	17	17	17	17	16	17	17	17	17
General Education									
Curriculum theory and development	1	6	1	4	3	3.5	2	3	2
Reading	6	5	8	6	1	2	3	2	5
Psychological Areas									
Child development; child psychology	4	2	3	2	5	3.5	5.5	4	3
Guidance and counseling	7	7	5	7	6	6	5.5	6	6
Educational and psychological measurement	12.5	13	10	13	10	10	10.5	10.5	12
Administration and Supervision									
Administration	11	11	11	12	13	7	10.5	10.5	11
Supervision	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Speech and Hearing									
Speech and hearing science	9	3.5	6	5	8	12	8	9	7
Clinical audiometry	12.5	14	13	14	15	15	15	15	15
Subsidiary Areas									
Linguistics; psycholinguistics	8	12	14	10	14	14	14	14	13
Research techniques and statistics	15	15	16	15.5	17	16	16	16	16

Table 68. Rating scores and rankings of graduate courses in supervisor preparation programs (highest possible rating score is 400)

Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total Group	Rank
Day respondents							
1. Curriculum	340	1. Supervision	334	1. Curriculum	319	1. Supervision	328
2. Supervision	332	2. Child develop., psych.	332	2. Supervision	318	2. Child develop., psych.	327
3. Learning disabilities	324	3. Learning disabilities	328	3. Child develop.,psych.	312	3. Learning disabilities	325
4. Child develop.,psych.	316	4. Speech and Hearing	328	4. Learning disabilities	310	4. Curriculum	323
5. Research in sp.ed.	296	5. Reading	323	5. Guidance, counseling	306	5. Speech and Hearing	311
6. Reading	292	6. Curriculum	322	6. Speech and Hearing	300	6. Reading	307
7. Guidance,counseling	288	7. Guidance, counseling	294	7. Research in sp.ed.	289	7. Guidance, counseling	296
8. Linguistics	284	8. Psycho-soc. problems	290	8. Reading	284	8. Research in sp.ed.	291
9. Speech and Hearing	276	9. Research in sp.ed.	287	9. Psycho-soc. problems	268	9. Psycho-soc. problems	280
10. Psycho-soc. problems	260	10. Disturbed	284	10. Ed.,psych.measur.	256	10. Linguistics	265
11. Administration	244	11. Administration	270	11. Administration	252	11. Disturbed	261
12. Clinical audiometry	240	12. Linguistics	263	12. Disturbed	242	12. Administration	259
13. Ed.,psych. measur.	240	13. Ed.,psych. measur.	260	13. Clinical audiometry	239	13. Ed.,psych. measur.	254
14. Disturbed	228	14. Clinical audiometry	241	14. Linguistics	230	14. Clinical audiometry	238
15. Research, statistics	220	15. Research, statistics	231	15. Mentally retarded	191	15. Mentally retarded	216
16. Mentally retarded	184	16. Mentally retarded	224	16. Research, statistics	176	16. Research, statistics	216
17. Gifted	144	17. Gifted	166	17. Gifted	152	17. Gifted	157
Residential respondents							
1. Reading	349	1. Supervision	362	1. Supervision	340	1. Supervision	354
2. Supervision	341	2. Reading	344	2. Curriculum	336	2. Reading	342
3. Curriculum	330	3. Child develop.,psych.	339	3. Reading	324	3. Curriculum	335
4. Learning disabilities	324	4. Curriculum	339	4. Learning disabilities	312	4. Child develop., psych.	329
5. Child develop.,psych.	315	5. Learning disabilities	336	5. Child develop.,psych.	308	5. Learning disabilities	325
6. Guidance, counseling	305	6. Guidance, counseling	316	6. Guidance, counseling	308	6. Guidance, counseling	311
7. Disturbed	302	7. Administration	299	7. Disturbed	292	7. Disturbed	286
8. Speech and Hearing	288	8. Research in sp.ed.	286	8. Research in sp.ed.	292	8. Research in sp.ed.	285
9. Research in sp.ec.	281	9. Disturbed	275	9. Speech and Hearing	292	9. Speech and Hearing	278
10. Ed.,psych. measur.	274	10. Ed.,psych. measur.	273	10. Administration	284	10. Administration	277
11. Mentally retarded	270	11. Psycho-soc. problems	270	11. Ed.,psych. measur.	284	11. Ed.,psych. measur.	277
12. Psycho-soc. problems	262	12. Speech and Hearing	266	12. Mentally retarded	260	12. Psycho-soc.problems	264
13. Administration	237	13. Mentally retarded	261	13. Psycho-soc. problems	260	13. Mentally retarded	263
14. Linguistics	217	14. Linguistics	246	14. Linguistics	240	14. Linguistics	237
15. Clinical audiometry	199	15. Clinical audiometry	221	15. Clinical audiometry	224	15. Clinical audiometry	217
16. Gifted	193	16. Research, statistics	219	16. Research, statistics	220	16. Research, statistics	209
17. Research, statistics	183	17. Gifted	189	17. Gifted	192	17. Gifted	189

As mentioned, there is much agreement between total Day and Residential groups, and course rankings for the two groups are generally the same or within only one to three rank differences of each other. There are some exceptions, however. Thus, "Reading" and "Education of disturbed children" were considered relatively important by the Residential group, who ranked them 2 and 7, respectively, while the Day group ranked these courses 6 and 11. Conversely, Day respondents ranked "Speech and hearing science" 5 and "Linguistics; psycholinguistics" 10 while the Residential respondents gave them rankings of 9 and 14, respectively.

There are a few discrepancies of four or more ranking points between supervisor-types. Thus, within the Day group, "Curriculum theory and development" was ranked first by Supervisors-only (S) and Supervisor-teachers (S(A)T) but 6 by Supervisor-administrators (SA). There were also differences for "Speech and hearing science", ranked 9 by the Day S's, 3.5 by the SA's, and 6 by the S(A)T's; for "Linguistics; psycholinguistics", ranked 8 by Day S's, 12 by the SA's, and 14 by the S(A)T's; and for "Education of disturbed children", ranked 14 by the Day S's, 10 by the SA's, and 12 by the S(A)T's. For the Residential group there are only two courses on which supervisor-types disagreed by four or more ranking points: "Administration" was ranked 7 by the SA's, while the S's ranked this course 13 and the S(A)T's ranked it 10.5; and "Speech and hearing", which was ranked 12 by the SA's but 8 by the S's and S(A)T's.

4. Experiences for supervisor preparation programs. In addition to rating graduate courses for supervisor preparation programs, respondents were asked to rate four types of "experiences" as to their importance for preparation programs (item 5.3). The experiences were: "Planned observations in a wide variety of programs for the deaf"; "Internship with successful, established supervisors of the deaf"; "Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors"; and "Experience in interpreting psychological, educational, and medical reports and records". The same 0 to 4 rating scale was used as in previous items, and spaces were provided for additional responses. A full tabulation of responses to this item is contained in Table C4 of Appendix C. Table 69 lists the experiences according to rankings for the groups and also gives rating scores for each of the experiences.

Table 69. Rating scores and rankings of various experiences for supervisor preparation programs (highest possible rating score is 400)

Key.
Observations: Planned observations in a wide variety of programs for the deaf
Internship: Internship with successful, established supervisors of the deaf
Conferences: Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors
Reports: Experience in interpreting psychological, educational, and medical reports and records

Rank	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total Group	
	Day respondents							
1	Observations	332	Observations	353	Internship	333	Observations	339
2	Reports	304	Internship	339	Observations	321	Internship	327
3	Internship	292	Reports	314	Reports	282	Reports	307
4	Conferences	248	Conferences	301	Conferences	268	Conferences	284
	Residential respondents							
1	Internship	345	Observations	356	Observations	332	Observations	346
2	Observations	330	Internship	333	Conferences	308	Internship	333
3	Conferences	290	Conferences	312	Internship	304	Conferences	311
4	Reports	266	Reports	297	Reports	276	Reports	286

Rating scores indicate that both Day and Residential groups considered "Observations" (D 339, R 346) and "Internship" (D 327, R 333) of primary importance. The Day group rated "Interpreting reports" as "important" (307) and "Attending conferences" as "less important to important" (284). The Residential group reversed these two, ranking "Attending conferences" (311) third and "Interpreting reports" (286) fourth. Subgroup rankings of these experiences are in general agree with total group rankings, although some differences exist.

B. ADVANCED STUDY PROGRAMS FOR SUPERVISORS

In introducing questionnaire items 5.6 and 5.7, it was explained that "...consideration is being given to graduate level (certification or doctoral) programs specifically designed to provide advanced study opportunities for persons currently engaged in supervisory work." Each respondent was requested to "...suppose that you were to embark upon such a program" and then asked to rate graduate courses and experiences according to their importance for his individual program, as based upon his own background, needs, and interests.

1. Graduate courses for advanced study. Item 5.6 listed the same graduate courses discussed in a previous section and asked the respondents to rate these using the scale from 4 ("very important") to 0 ("undecided; no opinion"). A complete tabulation of responses is contained in Tables C5 and C6 of Appendix C. Table 70 presents a listing of these courses grouped by major areas together with their rankings for various groups and subgroups. Table 71 lists the courses according to rankings and also gives rating scores.

The six highest-ranking courses for the total group (Day and Residential) are: "Learning disabilities: diagnosis and remediation" (D 297, R 307); "Curriculum theory and development" (275, R 301); "Recent research in special education" (D 283; R 285); "Supervision" (D 262, R 300); "Reading" (D 242, R 294); and "Guidance and counseling" (D 255, R 274). The six courses ranked somewhat lower in importance are: "Education of disturbed and conduct-problem children" (D 240, R 282); "Child development' child psychology" (D 243, R 263); "Psycho-social problems of exceptional children" (D 236, R 246); "Speech and hearing science" (D 240, R 224; "Administration" (D 214, R 245); and "Linguistics; psycholinguistics" (D 236, R 221). Courses considered of less importance were: "Educational and psychological measurement" (D 207, R 234); "Psychology and education of the mentally retarded" (D 187, R 242); "Research techniques and statistics" (D 189, R 210); "Clinical audiometry" (D 214, R 181); and "Psychology of education of the gifted" (D 146, R 169).

There are some noteworthy differences (e.g., differences of three or more ranking places) between the total Day and Residential groups. Courses which the Day group ranked higher than the Residential group are: "Recent research in special education" (Day ranking 2, Residential ranking 5); "Speech and hearing science" (D 8.5, R 13); "Clinical audiometry" (D 12.5, R 16); and "Linguistics; psycholinguistics" (D 10.5, R 14). Courses rated higher by the Residential group are: "Reading" (D 7, R 4) and "Psychology and education of the mentally retarded" (D 16, R 11).

Within the Day and Residential groups, there are some differences of four or more rankings between supervisor-types. Thus, for the Day group these differences occur for the following courses:

Table 70. Courses for advanced study by supervisors: groupings by major areas and rankings of courses for various groups

	Day Respondents				Residential Respondents				Day and Resid.
	S	SA	SAT	Total	S	SA	SAT	Total	
Special Education									
Recent research in special education	1.5	2	3	2	7	5	5	5	3
Psycho-social problems of exceptional children	10.5	10.5	6	10.5	9.5	10	13	9	9
Learning disabilities: diagnosis and remediation	3	1	2	1	1	2	4	1	1
Education of disturbed and conduct-problem children	9	6	14	8.5	2	9	7.5	6	7
Psychology and education of the mentally retarded	15.5	15	16	16	6	15	9.5	11	14
Psychology and education of the gifted	17	17	17	17	15	17	17	17	17
General Education									
Curriculum theory and development	1.5	4	5	3	4	4	1	2	2
Reading	5	9	7	7	3	3	2	4	5
Psychological Areas									
Child development; child psychology	7	7	8	6	9.5	8	6	8	8
Guidance and counseling	4	8	4	5	8	6	7.5	7	6
Educational and psychological measurement	15.5	14	12	14	12	11	11	12	13
Administration and Supervision									
Administration	14	13	9	12.5	14	7	9.5	10	11
Supervision	6	5	1	4	5	1	3	3	4
Speech and Hearing									
Speech and hearing science	10.5	3	10	8.5	11	14	12	13	10
Clinical audiometry	12	12	13	12.5	17	16	16	16	16
Subsidiary Areas									
Linguistics; psycholinguistics	8	10.5	11	10.5	13	13	14	14	12
Research techniques and statistics	13	16	15	15	16	12	15	15	15

Table 71. Supervisors' rating scores and rankings of graduate courses for their own advanced study (highest possible rating score is 400)

	Group S			Group SA			Group S(A)T			Total Group	Rank
	Day respondents										
1.	Curriculum	304	1.	Learning disabilities	297	1.	Supervision	299	1.	Learning disabilities	297
2.	Research in sp.ed.	304	2.	Research in sp.ed.	276	2.	Learning disabilities	284	2.	Research in sp.ed.	283
3.	Learning disabilities	300	3.	Speech and Hearing	270	3.	Research in sp.ed.	281	3.	Curriculum	275
4.	Guidance, counseling	252	4.	Curriculum	268	4.	Guidance, counseling	279	4.	Supervision	262
5.	Reading	244	5.	Supervision	265	5.	Curriculum	276	5.	Guidance, counseling	255
6.	Supervision	240	6.	Disturbed	258	6.	Psycho-soc. problems	247	6.	Child develop., psych.	243
7.	Child develop.,psych.	236	7.	Child develop.,psych.	251	7.	Reading	236	7.	Reading	242
8.	Linguistics	232	8.	Guidance, counseling	249	8.	Child develop.,psych.	232	8.	Disturbed	240
9.	Disturbed	228	9.	Reading	246	9.	Administration	226	9.	Speech and Hearing	240
10.	Psycho-soc. problems	204	10.	Linguistics	245	10.	Speech and Hearing	217	10.	Linguistics	236
11.	Speech and Hearing	204	11.	Psycho-soc. problems	245	11.	Linguistics	215	11.	Psycho-soc. problems	236
12.	Clinical audiometry	192	12.	Clinical audiometry	230	12.	Ed.,psych. measur.	210	12.	Administration	214
13.	Research, statistics	184	13.	Administration	227	13.	Clinical audiometry	207	13.	Clinical audiometry	214
14.	Administration	176	14.	Ed.,psych. measur.	225	14.	Disturbed	202	14.	Ed.,psych. measur.	207
15.	Ed.,psych. measur.	160	15.	Mentally retarded	196	15.	Research, statistics	177	15.	Research, statistics	189
16.	Mentally retarded	160	16.	Research, statistics	195	16.	Mentally retarded	176	16.	Mentally retarded	187
17.	Gifted	132	17.	Gifted	153	17.	Gifted	140	17.	Gifted	146
	Residential respondents										
1.	Learning disabilities	313	1.	Supervision	302	1.	Curriculum	344	1.	Learning disabilities	307
2.	Disturbed	307	2.	Learning disabilities	294	2.	Reading	324	2.	Curriculum	301
3.	Reading	297	3.	Reading	288	3.	Supervision	320	3.	Supervision	300
4.	Curriculum	295	4.	Curriculum	286	4.	Learning disabilities	316	4.	Reading	294
5.	Supervision	293	5.	Research in sp.ed.	280	5.	Research in sp.ed.	312	5.	Research in sp.ed.	285
6.	Mentally retarded	270	6.	Guidance, counseling	272	6.	Child develop.,psych.	304	6.	Disturbed	282
7.	Research in sp.ed.	268	7.	Administration	271	7.	Disturbed	292	7.	Guidance, counseling	274
8.	Guidance, counseling	263	8.	Child develop.,psych.	264	8.	Guidance, counseling	292	8.	Child develop.,psych.	263
9.	Child develop.,psych.	233	9.	Disturbed	259	9.	Administration	272	9.	Psycho-soc. problems	246
10.	Psycho-soc. problems	233	10.	Psycho-soc. problems	248	10.	Mentally retarded	272	10.	Administration	245
11.	Speech and Hearing	215	11.	Ed.,psych. measur.	240	11.	Ed.,psych. measur.	264	11.	Mentally retarded	242
12.	Ed.,psych. measur.	214	12.	Research, statistics	233	12.	Speech and Hearing	260	12.	Ed.,psych. measur.	234
13.	Linguistics	199	13.	Linguistics	225	13.	Psycho-soc. problems	256	13.	Speech and Hearing	224
14.	Administration	194	14.	Speech and Hearing	217	14.	Linguistics	240	14.	Linguistics	221
15.	Gifted	173	15.	Mentally retarded	212	15.	Research, statistics	224	15.	Research, statistics	210
16.	Research, statistics	166	16.	Clinical audiometry	187	16.	Clinical audiometry	208	16.	Clinical audiometry	181
17.	Clinical audiometry	155	17.	Gifted	161	17.	Gifted	172	17.	Gifted	169

	Day subgroups: Ranking of courses		
	S	SA	S(A)T
Supervision	6	5	1
Guidance and counseling	4	8	4
Reading	5	9	7
Education of disturbed and conduct-problem children	9	6	14
Speech and hearing science	10.5	3	6
Psycho-social problems of exceptional children	10.5	10.5	6
Administration	14	13	9

There is more agreement among Residential supervisor-types with only the following ranking differences of four or more occurring:

	Residential subgroups: Ranking of courses		
	S	SA	S(A)T
Education of disturbed and conduct-problem children	2	9	7.5
Administration	14	7	9.5
Psychology and education of the mentally retarded	6	15	9.5
Research techniques and statistics	16	12	15

It is interesting also to compare the total respondent (Day plus Residential) rankings of courses for supervisor preparation programs and for "the respondents' own" advanced study. There is general agreement between the two sets of ranking, but differences as large as three or more do exist. Thus, "Supervision" is ranked first for supervisory preparation programs, which are intended for experienced teachers without previous supervisory experience, but fourth for the respondents themselves. Other courses considered more important for preparation programs than for advanced study are "Child development' child psychology" and "Speech and hearing science". Courses which the respondents consider important for their own study but less important for preparation programs are "Recent research in special education" and "Learning disabilities: diagnosis and remediation".

2. Experiences for advanced study programs. Respondents were presented with the same four "experiences" given for supervisory preparation programs and asked to rate them according to importance for their own advanced study (item 5.7). A full tabulation of responses to this item is contained in Table C7 of Appendix C. Table 72 lists the experiences by rankings for the groups and subgroups and also gives rating scores.

Table 72. Rating scores and rankings of various experiences for advanced study programs for supervisors (highest possible rating score is 400)

Key. Observations: Planned observations in a wide variety of programs for the deaf
Internship: Internship with successful, established supervisors of the deaf
Conferences: Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors
Reports: Experience in interpreting psychological, educational, and medical reports and records

Rank	Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total Group	
	Day respondents							
1	Observations	308	Observations	321	Internship	315	Observations	316
2	Internship	272	Internship	296	Observations	297	Internship	294
3	Conferences	260	Conferences	292	Conferences	283	Conferences	283
4	Reports	248	Reports	277	Reports	253	Reports	266
	Residential respondents							
1	Observations	323	Observations	323	Observations	324	Observations	326
2	Internship	315	Internship	307	Conferences	324	Internship	310
3	Conferences	292	Conferences	305	Internship	300	Conferences	304
4	Reports	260	Reports	274	Reports	252	Reports	264

The rating scores for all of the experiences in Table 72 are lower than those given for supervisor preparation programs (Table 69), but the experience rankings for the total groups remain almost the same. Thus, both Day and Residential groups rank "Planned observations in a wide variety of programs for the deaf" first (D 316, R 326), "Internship with successful, experienced supervisors of the deaf" second (D 294, R 310), "Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors" third, (D 283, R 304), and "Experience in interpreting psychological, educational, and medical reports and records" fourth, (D 266, R 264).

It is interesting to note the high ranking accorded "Internship" by the respondents for their own advanced study despite the fact that these persons are already supervisors themselves. The rating scores of approximately 300 indicate that this type of experience was considered "important" by the groups as a whole and may indicate feelings of need for extended experiences and guided practice in supervision. The high ranking of "Observation" may reflect a desire to contact and exchange ideas with supervisors and teachers in other programs for the deaf.

REFERENCES

Braught, Patricia. Program and services of an educational consultant or supervisor in a school for the deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 112, March, 1967, 60-63.

Bryan, J. E. The responsibilities of a supervising teacher from the viewpoint of a superintendent. *Report Proc. 35 Meeting C.A.I.D.**, 1965, 50-59.

Casey, Katherine A. Supervising the new teacher. *Report Proc. 33 Meeting C.A.I.D.**, 1947, 143-148.

Directory of Schools and Classes for the Deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 110, January, 1965, 222-269.

Directory of Schools and Classes for the Deaf. *Directory of Services for the Deaf in the United States* - *American Annals of the Deaf*, 111, January, 1966, 298-347.

Education of the Deaf. The Challenge and the Charge. A Report of the National Conference on Education of the Deaf, Colorado Springs, April 12-15, 1967. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968.

Groht, Mildred A. The supervising teacher. *Proc. 31 Meeting C.A.I.D.**, 1939, 159-166.

Groht, Mildred A. The role of the supervising teacher in respect to language. *Report Proc. 37 Meeting C.A.I.D.*, 1955, 179-183.

Hamel, Clara A. The supervising teacher's part in the building of and the use of an English course of study. *Report Proc. 38 Meeting C.A.I.D.**, 1957, 145-148.

Hoffmeyer, Ben E. Supervision as authorities see it. *Report Proc. 35 Meeting C.A.I.D.**, 1951, 317-326.

Killorin, Adelaide Coffey. What the supervising teacher expects of her superintendent and teachers. *Report Proc. 34 Meeting C.A.I.D.**, 1949, 123-125.

Mayers, Lewis M. Supervision in the Northwest. *Report Proc. 35 Meeting C.A.I.D.**, 1951, 311-316

McMillan, Katherine. The essential qualifications of a good supervising teacher. *Report Proc. 35 Meeting C.A.I.D.**, 1951, 310-311.

Patton, Livingston. Problems of adjustments and coordination of a supervising teacher. *Report Proc. 37 Meeting C.A.I.D.**, 1955, 188-191.

---

*Report of the Proceedings of the __th Meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

REFERENCES (con't.)

A Proposed Plan for the Improvement of the Education of the Deaf and Severely Hard of Hearing in California. Second Deaft of the Combined North and South Subtopic Committee Reports. California State Department of Education, 1967.

Schunhoff, Hugo. Orienting the newly trained teacher. Report Proc. 33 Meeting C.A.I.D.*, 1947, 138-143.

Schunhoff, Hugo. Bases of a comprehensive program in the education of deaf children. American Annals of the Deaf, 109, March, 1964, 240-247.

Schinpaugh, J. R., Jr. Supervision of new teachers, trained and untrained. Report Proc. 34 Meeting C.A.I.D.*, 1949, 42-49.

Snider, Maureen. What a teacher expects of her superintendent and supervising teacher. Report Proc. 34 Meeting C.A.I.D.*, 1949, 126-128.

APPENDIX A

The Study Questionnaire

IREC

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH
ON EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

NATIONAL PROJECT ON

SUPERVISION

OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

IREC

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Please read each item carefully and follow the instructions. Notice that some items call for a number of checks; others ask you to check only the one response which comes closest to describing your situation.

Confine yourself to the requested responses if possible. Should additional remarks be necessary, please write them in on the questionnaire or on separate sheets of paper.

This is YOUR identification number.

In analyzing the information you give in this questionnaire, reference is always made by number, not by name.

Please do not put your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

Introduction:

The terms "SUPERVISION" and "SUPERVISOR" have somewhat ambiguous meanings within educational systems for the deaf.

For example, the title "SUPERVISOR" may refer to someone who supervises children in extracurricular activities or a teacher who works with children in art, physical education, homemaking, vocational skills, or other areas.

On the other hand, there may be persons engaged in teacher supervision who do not have the title "SUPERVISOR". Often this responsibility for supervision of teachers is incorporated into positions like "head teacher", "principal", or "director".

This questionnaire is directed to **INDIVIDUALS, WITH OR WITHOUT THE TITLE "SUPERVISOR", WHOSE RESPONSIBILITIES INCLUDE, EITHER FULLY OR IN PART, SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF.**

0.1 Are YOU responsible for supervision of teachers in classes for the deaf? (Check one.)
_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

- - **IF YOUR ANSWER TO THIS ITEM IS "YES"**, please complete the remainder of this questionnaire, beginning with item 1.1

- - **IF YOUR ANSWER TO THIS ITEM IS "NO"**, please complete only item 0.2 AND items 1.1 through 1.6. Then return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

0.2 Did you supervise classes for the deaf during the 1964-65 school year?
_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

If "yes", how many years had you supervised in this system up until June, 1965? _________ 3) years

---

1.0 The following set of questions concerns THE NATURE OF YOUR SUPERVISORY POSITION AND THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IN WHICH YOU WORK.

Please answer these items as they apply to the 1965-66 school year.

1.1 In what type of school system do you work? (Check one.)

_____ 1) Public
_____ 2) Private, Nondenominational
_____ 3) Private, Denominational

_____ 4) Other: ______________________

1.2 Do you work in a RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL?

_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

If "yes", APPROXIMATELY what percentage of your student population consists of DAY STUDENTS?

_____ 3) 9% or less
_____ 4) 10 - 19%
_____ 5) 20 - 29%
_____ 6) 30 - 39%
_____ 7) 40 - 49%
_____ 8) 50 - 59%
_____ 9) 60% or more

1.3 Do you work in DAY CLASSES OR A DAY SCHOOL?

_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

If "yes", please answer the following items.

In HOW MANY DIFFERENT LOCATIONS (separate schools) are these classes located? _________ 3) locations

HOW MANY TEACHERS of the deaf are there in each location?

	Teachers:		Teachers:
Location 1	_____	Location 6	_____
Location 2	_____	Location 7	_____
Location 3	_____	Location 8	_____
Location 4	_____	Location 9	_____
Location 5	_____	Location 10	_____

Are any of these locations considered "DAY SCHOOLS"?

_____ 11) No
_____ 12) Yes: Location(s): _____; _____; _____.

1.4. Total number of DEAF STUDENTS in your educational system:

_________ 1) students

1.5 Total number of TEACHERS OF THE DEAF (academic; vocational; special teachers; etc.) in your educational system:

_________ 1) teachers of the deaf

1.6 Total number of "ACADEMIC" teachers of the deaf (classroom teachers responsible for academic areas, language, reading, etc.):

_________ 1) academic teachers of the deaf

1.7 How many teachers of the deaf are YOU responsible for SUPERVISING?

1) Academic. (number): ____________ teachers

2) Vocational. (number): ____________ teachers

3) Special teachers (art; phys. ed.; etc.)

(number): ____________ teachers

1.8 Are there OTHER PERSONS who supervise ACADEMIC TEACHERS of the deaf in your educational system?

_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

If "yes", how many other supervisors are there?

3) _________ other supervisors

1.9 How many teachers in your system are NOT supervised?

1) Academic. (number): ____________ teachers

2) Vocational. (number): ____________ teachers

1.10 In what AGE RANGES are most of the deaf children in classes which you are responsible for supervising?

_____ 1) All ages listed below
OR, specific age levels
(Check ALL that apply.)
_____ 2) 3 years old or younger
_____ 3) 4, 5 years old
_____ 4) 6, 7, 8 years old
_____ 5) 9, 10, 11 years old
_____ 6) 12, 13, 14 years old
_____ 7) 15, 16, 17 years old
_____ 8) 18 years old or older

1.11 Which categories below best describe the AREAS YOU SUPERVISE?

_____ 1) All areas of classroom instruction (language; communication; subject areas; etc.)
OR
only specific areas of instruction
(Check ALL that apply.)
_____ 2) Language
_____ 3) Speech
_____ 4) Reading
_____ 5) Vocational areas

Other areas:

_____ 6) ______________
_____ 7) ______________
_____ 8) ______________

1.12 Are you responsible for SUPERVISION of OTHER TEACHERS besides teachers of the deaf?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", please fill in the appropriate blanks below.

Number: ____ 3) teachers of children with primary handicaps other than deafness

What types of handicaps:

4) ______________________________

____

Number: ____ 5) teachers of non-handicapped children

What grades, levels, or subject areas:

6) ______________________________

____

1.13 Do you hold an ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION in addition to your supervisory work?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", check ALL appropriate positions below:

____ 3) Head teacher

____ 4) Vice principal

____ 5) Principal

____ 6) Director of special education

____ 7) Assistant superintendent

Other:

____ 8) ____________

____

____ 9) ____________

____

1.14 If you answered "yes" to item 1.13, for which children are you responsible AS AN ADMINISTRATOR? (Check ALL appropriate items.)

____ 1) All deaf children in the system

____ 2) Only certain grades (or levels) of deaf children within total program

____ 3) Hard of hearing children

____ 4) Children with major handicaps other than hearing loss

____ 5) Non-handicapped children

____ 6) Other: ______________________________

____ 7) ______________________________

1.15 Is there an OFFICIAL TITLE connected with your supervisory position and/or other positions?

____ 1) No

____ 2) Yes. (Please write the titles here):

3) ______________________________

4) ______________________________

5) ______________________________

1.16 TO WHOM ARE YOU DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE (your immediate superior) in your position as a supervisor? (Check one.)

____ 1) No immediate superior

____ 2) Principal of deaf and other classes

____ 3) Principal of classes for the deaf only

____ 4) Assistant superintendent

____ 5) Other: ______________________________

1.17 Do you regularly do SUBSTITUTE TEACHING (in cases of teacher illness or absence)? (Check two.)

With deaf children: ____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

With other children: ____ 3) No ____ 4) Yes

1.18 Do you regularly do individual or small-group TUTORIAL TEACHING? (Check one.)

With deaf children: ____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

With other children: ____ 3) No ____ 4) Yes

1.19 Do you TEACH A CLASS OR CLASSES OF YOUR OWN in addition to your supervisory work?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", please answer the items below.

Are the children Deaf? ____ 3) No ____ 4) Yes

Approximately how much time is devoted to teaching?

____ 5) Full time

____ 6) Three-fourths time

____ 7) Half time

____ 8) One-fourth time

____ 9) Less than one-fourth time

How old are the children you teach?

______________________________ 10)

What grade level or subjects do you teach?

______________________________ 11)

2.0 SUPERVISION PRACTICES vary widely from person to person and situation to situation. Some positions dictate a fairly passive role, with the supervisor acting mainly as a consultant or resource person. In other programs the supervisor participates quite actively in classroom proceedings.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to describe CURRENT SUPERVISION PRACTICES in education of the deaf. For this reason, it is essential that the following answers reflect YOUR individual role as a supervisor -- not an idealized picture of "what a supervisor should do" or "things you would do if conditions permitted".

Please be frank. Answer these items as they pertain to the supervisory work you are presently doing.

2.1 How many hours do you spend (on the average) in ALL TYPES OF ACTIVITIES CONNECTED WITH YOUR POSITION AS A SUPERVISOR OF TEACHERS OF THE DEAF?

(Fill in the blank which seems most appropriate for your situation.)

_____ 1) hours per WEEK
or
_____ 2) hours per MONTH

2.2 Do you spend time VISITING classrooms for the deaf FOR THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF SUPERVISION (observing and evaluating work done with the children)?

_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

- - IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO THE ABOVE QUESTION, proceed to the next items.

- - IF YOU ANSWERED "NO", do NOT answer items 2.3 to 2.15. Continue, beginning with item 2.16.

The following items are all concerned with your SUPERVISORY VISITS to TEACHERS OF THE DEAF.

2.3 How many hours (on the average) do you spend in SUPERVISORY VISITS to classrooms for the deaf? (Fill in the most appropriate blank.)

_____ 1) hours per WEEK
or
_____ 2) hours per MONTH

2.4 Supervisory visits, of course, vary in LENGTH OF TIME. But how long would you ESTIMATE that you spend in the classroom during these visits?

Shorter visits average about _____ minutes. 1)

Longer visits average about _____ minutes. 2)

An average supervisory visit lasts about _____ minutes. 3)

2.5 Below are listed a number of TOPICS which you probably DISCUSS with teachers during supervisory visits.

Check THREE which seem to be of the most concern to teachers whom you visit.

_____ 1) Behavior problems and adjustment difficulties of children
_____ 2) Classroom administration (scheduling, grouping, etc.)
_____ 3) Home-school relations; parents and parent counseling
_____ 4) Teaching techniques and materials
_____ 5) Special techniques for specific children in the class
_____ 6) Extracurricular activities of the children
_____ 7) Administrative concerns (psychological testing; class compositions; reports; etc.)
_____ 8) Other: _____
_____ 9) Other: _____

2.6 Approximately WHAT PERCENT of your time during a visit is devoted to the FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES?

_____% 1) Observing the teacher and children at work
_____% 2) Conferring with the teacher
_____% 3) Other: _____
_____% 4) Other: _____

100% Total

2.7 Do you find it useful to OFFER COMMENTS AND DISCUSS TEACHING TECHNIQUES with the teacher WHILE THE CLASS IS IN SESSION? (Check one.)

_____ 1) Extremely useful
_____ 2) Quite useful
_____ 3) Moderately useful
_____ 4) Of some use
_____ 5) Not useful

2.8 Do you hold CONFERENCES with teachers concerning the visits?

_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

If "yes", approximately what percent of your visits include or are followed by conferences?
_____% 3)

2.9 During your visits do you DEMONSTRATE TECHNIQUES by working with the children yourself? (Check one.)

_____ 1) Very frequently
_____ 2) Frequently
_____ 3) Occasionally
_____ 4) Seldom
_____ 5) Never

2.10 Approximately HOW MANY SUPERVISORY VISITS do you pay to an average teacher during the course of a year? _________ visits 1)

.11 Approximately what percent of your visits are "surprise visits" in which the teacher is not informed of your coming ahead of time?

_________% 1)

2.12 In your SCHEDULED VISITS, how much notice is the teacher generally given?

_____ 1) A few hours
_____ 2) One day
_____ 3) Two days
_____ 4) Three to six days
_____ 5) A week or more

2.13 Do you prepare WRITTEN REPORTS of supervisory visits?

_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

If "yes", approximately what percent of your visits are written up in reports? _________% 3)

2.14 IF YOU DO PREPARE REPORTS, what is done with copies of the reports? (Check ALL appropriate items.)

_____ 1) Retained in supervisory files
_____ 2) Sent to superintendent or vice-superintendent
_____ 3) Sent to the principal
_____ 4) Sent to the teacher
_____ 5) Other: ______________________________
_____ 6) Other: ______________________________

2.15 No two supervisory visits are ever exactly the same, and you probably follow different procedures at different times and for different purposes.

NEVERTHELESS, please describe (or outline) briefly the TYPICAL procedures you use during an AVERAGE classroom visit.

____
____
____
____
____
____
____

2.16 Do you CONSULT with INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS OF THE DEAF outside of class visits (conferences not directly related to supervisory visits)?

_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

If "yes", APPROXIMATELY how many hours PER MONTH do you spend in such advisory meetings?
_________ hours per month 3)

2.17 Do you, AS A SUPERVISOR, HOLD MEETINGS with groups of teachers?

_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

If "yes", approximately how many such meetings do you have during the course of a YEAR? ________ 3)

For what purposes are these meetings held?

1) ______________________________________
2) ______________________________________
3) ______________________________________

2.18 Do STUDENT TEACHERS spend time working in your educational system for the deaf?

_____ 1) No _____ 2) Yes

If "yes", what are your responsibilities concerning the student teacher? (Check ALL appropriate items.)

_____ 3) Few or no responsibilities
_____ 4) Full responsibility for placement of student teachers in classrooms
_____ 5) Partial responsibility for placement
_____ 6) Full responsibility for supervision of student teachers' work in classrooms
_____ 7) Partial responsibility for supervision
_____ 8) Holding meetings with student teacher groups
_____ 9) Holding conferences with individual student teachers
_____10) Other: ______________________________
____
_____11) Other: ______________________________
____

2.19 Of the things you do as a supervisor, which do YOU consider your most important functions?

____
____
____
____
____

2.20 What sort of PROBLEMS OR DIFFICULTIES do YOU often encounter in your supervisory work?

____
____
____
____
____

3.0 The items in this section are concerned with EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND.

3.1 Please list the earned degrees you now hold.

Degree: Year: Institution; location:

1) ____ ___ ______________________________
Major: ______________________
2) ____ ___ ______________________________
Major: ______________________
3) ____ ___ ______________________________
Major: ______________________

3.2 Are you CURRENTLY a DEGREE CANDIDATE?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", please fill in the following items:

3) Degree sought: ________

4) Major area: ______________________

5) Institution: ______________________

Location: ______________________

6) Year expect to be completed: __________

7) I have completed ______ semester hours/quarter hours (circle one) toward this degree.

3.3 Please indicate COURSES (credit and non-credit) taken outside of work on degree during the past 10 years.

________ 1) None

Course (title or description): Institution: Year:

1) ______________________ __________ ______
2) ______________________ __________ ______
3) ______________________ __________ ______
4) ______________________ __________ ______
5) ______________________ __________ ______
6) ______________________ __________ ______
7) ______________________ __________ ______

3.4 How many years (including 1965-66) have you been engaged in SUPERVISORY WORK with teachers of the deaf?

Present program: Full time ____ 1) years
Part time ____ 2) years

Other programs: Full time ____ 3) years
Part time ____ 4) years

3.5 How many years (including 1965-66) have you TAUGHT THE DEAF? (Check ALL appropriate items.)

____ 1) None (Go to item 3.9)

Number:

____ 2) years as a FULL TIME teacher; NO supervisory responsibility
____ 3) years as a FULL TIME teacher; WITH supervisory responsibility
____ 4) years as a PART TIME teacher; NO supervisory responsibility
____ 5) years as a PART TIME teacher; WITH supervisory responsibility

____ 6) Other: ______________________________
____

____ 7) Other: ______________________________
____

3.6 What AGES have you worked with as a TEACHER OF THE DEAF? (Check ALL age groups that best represent your teaching experience.)

____ 1) 3 years old or younger
____ 2) 4, 5 years old
____ 3) 6, 7, 8 years old
____ 4) 9, 10, 11 years old
____ 5) 12, 13, 14 years old
____ 6) 15, 16, 17 years old
____ 7) 18 years old or older

3.7 Have you taught deaf children in a SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOM, teaching most or all subjects in the curriculum?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

3.8 Have you taught SPECIFIC SUBJECTS to deaf children as a special teacher, subject matter teacher, or resource teacher? (e.g., speech; auditory training; social studies; art; etc.)

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", list the areas in which you have specialized:

1) ________________ 5) ________________
2) ________________ 6) ________________
3) ________________ 7) ________________
4) ________________ 8) ________________

3.9 Have you had experience as a TEACHER of CHILDREN WITH HANDICAPS OTHER THAN DEAFNESS?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", please indicate experience:

Type of handicap; ages or levels: Number of years:

3) ____________________ ____________
4) ____________________ ____________
5) ____________________ ____________
6) ____________________ ____________
7) ____________________ ____________

3.10 Have you had experience as a CLASSROOM TEACHER OF NON-HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", please indicate experience:

		Number of years:
Nursery and/or kindergarden	3)	____
Primary	4)	____
Elementary	5)	____
Junior high and/or Senior high	6)	____
Combinations of the above:		
____________________	7)	____
____________________	8)	____

If you taught special areas or subjects, please write them here:

____________________ 9) ____________
____________________ 10) ____________
____________________ 11) ____________
____________________ 12) ____________

3.11 FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS (outside of teaching and supervision) in education, work with the deaf, and related areas.

Have you held any such positions in the past?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", please indicate these positions below:

Position; employer: Number of years

3) ______________________________
4) ______________________________
5) ______________________________
6) ______________________________
7) ______________________________
8) ______________________________

3.12 PUBLICATIONS: ARTICLES. Please indicate articles you have published in professional journals.

________ 1) None

Journal: Year: Title or topic of article:

2) ________ ____ ____________________
3) ________ ____ ____________________
4) ________ ____ ____________________
5) ________ ____ ____________________
6) ________ ____ ____________________
7) ________ ____ ____________________
8) ________ ____ ____________________
9) ________ ____ ____________________

3.13 Please indicate OTHER PUBLICATIONS, including books, chapters, monographs, booklets, special reports, etc.

________ 1) None

Type of publ.: Year: Title or topic:

2) ________ ____ ____________________
3) ________ ____ ____________________
4) ________ ____ ____________________
5) ________ ____ ____________________
6) ________ ____ ____________________
7) ________ ____ ____________________
8) ________ ____ ____________________

3.14 Please indicate attendance and participation at PROFESSIONAL CONVENTIONS AND MEETINGS over the past 6 years (since January, 1960).

Write in the number of meetings you attended only and the number in which you participated (as a speaker; panel member; etc.)

________ 1) None attended

	Attend only; Number:	Attend and participate; Number:
2) Internat'l Congress - Deaf .	____	____
3) A.G. Bell Ass'n - National .	____	____
4) A.G. Bell Ass'n - Regional .	____	____
5) Conference of Executives . .	____	____
6) Amer. Instructors of Deaf .	____	____
7) CEC - National Convention .	____	____
8) CEC - State Convention . . .	____	____
9) ASHA - National Convention .	____	____
10) Other: ____________	____	____
11) ____________	____	____
12) ____________	____	____
13) ____________	____	____
14) ____________	____	____

3.15 MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS concerned with education, work with the deaf, and related areas.

Please indicate whether you are a member only or an official (official; board member; consultant; etc.).

____ 1) None

Check only one blank for each organization of which you are a member.

National organizations:	Member only:	Member & Official:
2) Alexander Graham Bell Ass'n	____	____
3) Conference of Executives	____	____
4) Amer. Instructors of Deaf	____	____
5) C.E.C.	____	____
6) A.S.H.A.	____	____
7) N.E.A.	____	____
8) Other: ____________	____	____
9) ____________	____	____
10) ____________	____	____
11) ____________	____	____
Regional, State and Local:		
12) ____________	____	____
13) ____________	____	____
14) ____________	____	____
15) ____________	____	____
16) ____________	____	____
17) ____________	____	____

3.16 Please indicate your participation in other professional activities during the past year (Sept., 1964 through Aug., 1965).

1) Participation in workshops and conferences:

2) Major speaking engagements:

3) Membership on special committees or boards:

4) Other:

3.17 Are you certified by the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

3.18 Are you certified by the American Speech and Hearing Association?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", in what areas are you certified?

____ 3) Speech only
____ 4) Hearing only
____ 5) Speech and hearing

3.19 What STATE certification(s) do you hold in regular education, education of the deaf, and related areas? (Specify grades or levels if this is part of the certification.)

1) ____________________

2) ____________________

3) ____________________

4) ____________________

4.1 In what PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL ACTIVITES did you take part (in addition to your supervisory work) during the 1964-65 school year?

____ 1) None

If you did participate, please check the one appropriate blank for each activity.

Activities related to the program in education of the deaf:	Participant in; engaged in:	Participant and director, officer, co-ordinator, etc
2) Parent-teacher organization	____	____
3) Parent education and counseling program	____	____
4) In-service pgm. for teachers	____	____
5) Curriculum committee	____	____
6) Research related to instruction	____	____
7) Research not directly related to classroom instruction	____	____
8) Selection of textbooks and other educational materials	____	____
9) Other: ____________	____	____
10) ____________	____	____
11) ____________	____	____

4.2 What is the TIME BASIS of your position as a supervisor? Is it considered:

____ 1) a nine-month position
____ 2) a ten-month position
____ 3) an eleven-month position
____ 4) a twelve-month position with vacation

____ 5) Other: ____________________

4.3 If your position extends considerably beyond the length of the school year, what types of responsibilities do you have during the summer months?

1) ____________________
2) ____________________
3) ____________________
4) ____________________

4.4 Which category below best approximates your salary for the 1965-66 school year (gross salary before deductions)?

____1) Below $3000
____2) $3000 - $3999
____3) $4000 - $4999
____4) $5000 - $5999
____5) $6000 - $6999
____6) $7000 - $7999
____7) $8000 - $8999
____8) $9000 - $9999
____9) $10,000 - $10,999
____10) $11,000 - $11,999
____11) $12,000 - $12,999
____12) Over $13,000

4.5 Compare YOUR present salary with the approximate salary YOU WOULD EXPECT to be earning as a FULL-TIME CLASSROOM TEACHER of the deaf in YOUR educational system.

____ 1) The two salaries are about the same.
OR
The supervisory salary would be higher than the teaching salary by about:

____2) under $200
____3) $200 - $399
____4) $400 - $599
____5) $600 - $799
____6) $800 - $999
____7) $1000 - $1199
____8) $1200 - $1399
____9) $1400 - $1599
____10) $1600 - $1799
____11) over $1800

5.0 GRADUATE PROGRAMS FOR SUPERVISORS

A. Some thought is currently being given to establishing graduate programs to train supervisors of the deaf.

Because of your experience in education of the deaf, your opinions and ideas will undoubtedly prove of great help to institutions planning such programs.

5.1 Consider an individual who has taught the deaf (at various levels) and who has above-average teaching ability, leadership potential, and the ability to get along with others. This person would like to become a supervisor of teachers of the deaf.

What would you consider the MINIMUM number of years of actual classroom experience this person should have before becoming a half-time to full-time supervisor? (Check one.)

____1) No experience necessary
____2) 1 to 3 years
____3) 4 to 6 years
____4) 7 to 9 years
____5) 10 to 12 years
____6) 13 to 15 years
____7) 16 or more years

5.2 What sort of GRADUATE COURSES would you consider IMPORTANT for an experienced teacher of the deaf (described in 5.1) who would like to become a supervisor? (Please rate each of the courses below.)

Note: in rating the items, use this system:

4 - Very important
3 - Important
2 - Less important
1 - Not important
0 - Undecided; no opinion

Rating:

Psych. and education of the mentally retarded ____1)
Guidance and counseling . . . . ____2)
Recent research in special education. . . . . ____3)
Psych. and education of the gifted. . . . . . ____4)
Clinical audiometry . . . . ____5)
Curriculum theory and development . . . . . . ____6)
Supervision . . . . ____7)
Learning disabilities; diagnosis & remediation ____8)
Administration . . . . ____9)
Linguistics; psycholinguistics. . . . . ____10)
Child development; child psychology . . . . . ____11)
Speech and hearing science. . . . . ____12)
Research techniques and statistics. . . . . . ____13)
Reading . . . . ____14)
Educ. of disturbed and conduct-problem chn. . ____15)
Educational and psychological measurement . . ____16)
Psycho-social problems of exceptional chn . . ____17)

Other: ____________________ ____18)
____________________ ____19)
____________________ ____20)

5.3 How important would you consider the following types of experiences for the person described in item 5.1? (Please rate each experience, using the system described in 5.2.)

Rating:

Planned observations in a wide variety of programs for the deaf ____1)
Internship with successful, established supervisors of the deaf ____2)
Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors ____3)
Experience in interpreting psychological, educational, and medical reports and records ____4)

Other: ____________________
____________________ ____5)
____
____________________ ____6)

5.4 How important do you think graduate programs of various kinds would be in preparing teachers of the deaf to become supervisors? (Use the rating system from 5.2.)

Rating:

A doctoral (Ph.D. or Ed.D.) program ____1)

One year of work beyond the master's level ____2)

A master's degree ____3)

A one year program (with one or two summer sessions) ____4)

A series of summer sessions and workshops ____5)

Other: ________________ ____6)

5.5 Do you think that a non-doctoral program should lead to some sort of special certification?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes ____ 3) Undecided

B. Consideration is also being given to graduate level (certification or doctoral) programs specifically designed to provide advanced study opportunities for persons currently engaged in supervisory work.

5.6 Suppose that YOU were to embark upon such a program.

What sort of GRADUATE-COURSE WORK would you consider important for YOUR INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM, as based upon your own background, needs, and interests? (Use the rating scale from 5.2.)

Rating:

Psych. and education of the mentally retarded ____1)
Guidance and counseling . . . . ____2)
Recent research in special education . . . . ____3)
Psych. and education of the gifted. . . . . . ____4)
Clinical audiometry . . . . ____5)
Curriculum theory and development . . . . . . ____6)
Supervision . . . . ____7)
Learning disabilities; diagnosis & remediation ____8)
Administration . . . . ____9)
Linguistics; psycholinguistics . . . . ____10)
Child development; child psychology . . . . . ____11)
Speech and hearing science. . . . . ____12)
Research techniques and statistics. . . . . . ____13)
Reading . . . . ____14)
Educ. of disturbed and conduct problem chn. . ____15)
Educational and psychological measurement ____16)
Psycho-social problems of exceptional chn . . ____17)

Other: ________________ ____18)

________________ ____19)

________________ ____20)

5.7 How important would consider the following experiences for YOUR graduate program? (Use the rating scale from 5.2.)

Rating:

Planned observations in a wide variety of programs for the deaf ____1)

Work-experience with successful, established supervisors of the deaf ____2)

Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors ____3)

Experience in interpreting psychological, educational, and medical reports and records ____4)

Other: ________________

________________ ____5)

____

________________ ____6)

5.8 Do you have any comments or suggestions concerning supervisor training and advanced study programs mentioned above?

If so, please jot them down here.

6.0 IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

6.1 Sex: ____ 1) Female ____ 2) Male

6.2 Age:
____ 1) Under 30
____ 2) 30 - 39
____ 3) 40 - 49
____ 4) 50 - 59
____ 5) 60 - 69
____ 6) 70 or over

6.3 Do you have a hearing loss?

____ 1) No ____ 2) Yes

If "yes", please check the degree of loss for your better ear (without amplification):

____ 3) Mild
____ 4) Moderate
____ 5) Severe
____ 6) Profound

Do you wear a hearing aid?

____ 7) No ____ 8) Yes

7.0 We would greatly appreciate receiving your comments and opinions concerning:

a) the supervisor project;
b) this questionnaire;
c) other matters concerned with supervision.

(You may use the inside back cover.)

...THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN THIS PROJECT.

APPENDIX B

Supervisor Distribution Tables

The tables list all programs originally contacted for this study together with descriptive information on supervision for each program. The following explanations may prove useful in interpreting this data.

1. All Day programs are listed first, followed by a listing of Residential programs.
2. Program size-categories are based upon criteria discussed in Chapter III of the text.
3. No. Ss in Pgm., column 2, presents the number of supervisory personnel reported by each program administrator in response to a letter from the major investigator. A "0" in this column indicates that the administrator reported his program to have no supervisory personnel in the area of the deaf. An "NR" (No Response) indicates that the administrator did not reply to the initial or the follow-up letter.
4. No. Qs Used, column 3, represents for each program the number of supervisors whose returned questionnaires were used in this study. An "NR" indicates no returned questionnaires or return of unusable questionnaires.
5. Supervision-time, columns 4 through 8, represents for each supervisor the proportion of work-time devoted to "supervisory activities related to the program for the deaf" (including, but not consisting entirely of, classroom visits). The last column, "Unknown Time" (Unk.time), includes supervisor-type entries (explained below) for respondents who did not report time amounts. A fuller explanation of time-amount categories is given in Chapter III of the text.
6. Supervisor-types are based upon job responsibilities as reported by the respondents. The following symbols are used:

   s - supervision of teachers of the deaf
   s - supervision of teachers of the deaf and also other types of teachers
   T - teaching of deaf children (full or part time)
   A - administrative responsibilities in addition to supervisory responsibilities

   Combinations of these symbols are used to designate respondents with multiple responsibilities, e.g., sA, sA, sT, sT, sAT, and sAT.

Table B1. Supervisors in individual programs for the deaf

Pgm.	No. Ss in program	No. Qs used	Supervision-time: 3/4-full time	1/2-3/4 time	1/4-1/2 time	1/4 time or less	Unk. time
A. Day programs with 4-6 teachers							
1.	3	1	sA				
2.	2	2	s			sA	
3.	2	2	sAT	sAT			
4.	2	1				sT	
5.	2	1				sA	
6.	2	1					sA
7.	2	NR					
8.	1	1			sAT		
9.	1	1				sA	
10.	1	1	sT				
11.	1	1				s	
12.	1	1			sAT		
13.	1	1	sA				
14.	1	1		sA			
15.	1	1		sA			
16.	1	1				s	
17.	1	1		s			
18.	1	1				sA	
19.	1	1				s	
20.	1	1	sAT				
21.	1	1			sT		
22.	1	1		sT			
23.	1	1	sAT				
24.	1	1				sA	
25.	1	1	s				
26.	1	1				sA	
27.	1	1				sA	
28-35	1	NR					
36-43	0						
44-50	NR						

Pgm.	No. Ss in program	No. Qs used	Supervision-time: 3/4-full time	1/2-3/4 time	1/4-1/2 time	1/4 time or less	Unk. time
B. Day programs with 7-9 teachers							
1.	6	2			sA	sA	
2.	5	3		sA		sA,sA	
3.	3	3				sA,sA,sA	
4.	2	2	s			s	
5.	2	2	sAT			s	
6.	2	2			sA	sT	
7.	2	1		sA			
8.	2	1				sA	
9.	1	1				sA	
10.	1	1			sT		
11.	1	1	sAT				
12.	1	1				sAT	
13.	1	1				sA	
14.	1	1			sA		
15.						sA	
16.	1	1	sAT				
17.	1	1				sA	
18.	1	1	sA				
19.	1	1				sA	
20.	1	1	s				
21.	1	1	sA				
22.	1	1		sA			
23.	1	1				sA	
24.	1	1				sA	
25.	1	1				sT	
26.	1	1	sAT				
27-30	1	NR					
31.	0						
32.	NR						
C. Day programs with 10-14 teachers							
1.	4	3		sA	sA	sA	
2.	3	1	s				
3.	2	2	sA	s			
4.	1	1	sT				
5.	1	1	s				
6.	1	1		sT			
7.	1	1		sA			
8.	1	1	s				
9.	1	1	s				
10.	1	1				sA	
11.	0						
12.	0						
13.	0						
14.	NR						
15.	NR						

Table B1. Supervisors in individual programs for the deaf (con't.)

Pgm.	No. Ss in program	No. Qs used	Supervision-time 3/4-full time	1/2-3/4 time	1/4-1/2 time	1/4 time or less	Unk. time
D. Day programs with 15-19 teachers							
1.	5	1			sA		
2.	4	NR					
3.	3	2	sA		s		
4.	2	2			sA,sA		
5.	2	2		s	sA		
6.	2	1	s				
7.	1	1	sA				
8.	1	1	s				
9.	1	1	sA				
10.	1	NR					
11.	1	NR					
E. Day programs with 20-29 teachers							
1.	3	2	s,s				
2.	1	1		sA			
3.	1	1			sT		
4.	1	1		sA			
5.	1	1			s		
6.	1	1	s				
7.	1	1			s		
8.	1	1	s				
9.	1	NR					
10.	0						
11.	NR						
F. Day programs with 30 or more teachers							
1.	10	NR					
2.	7	3		sAT		sA	sA
3.	4	3		sA	sA	sA	
4.	4	3		sA,sA			sA
5.	3	3	s,sA			sT	
6.	2	NR					
7.	1	1			sA		
8.	NR						

Pgm.	No. Ss in program	No. Qs used	Supervision-time 3/4-full time	1/2-3/4 time	1/4-1/2 time	1/4 time or less	Unk. time
A. Resid programs with 4-9 teachers							
1.	3	2			sA		s
2.	1	1				sT	
3.	1	NR					
4.	0						
5.	0						
B. Resid programs with 10-19 teachers							
1.	3	2				sT,sT	
2.	3	2				sT,sT	
3.	3	1		sAT			
4.	2	2	sA,sA				
5.	2	1	sA				
6.	2	1				sAT	
7.	1	1	s				
8.	1	1	sAT				
9.	1	1	sA				
10.	1	1	sAT				
11.	1	1					sA
12.	1	NR					
13.	NR						
C. Resid programs with 20-29 teachers							
1.	4	3	s,sAT		sA		
2.	3	1	sA				
3.	3	NR					
4.	2	2	sA,sA				
5.	2	2	s		sA		
6.	2	NR					
7.	1	1					sA
8.	1	1				sA	
9.	1	1			sA		
10.	1	1	sA				
11.	1	1	s				
12.	1	1	sA				
13.	1	NR					
14.	0						

Table B1. Supervisors in individual programs for the deaf (con't)

Pgm.	No. Ss in program	No. Qs used	Supervision-time 3/4-full time	1/2-3/4 time	1/4-1/2 time	1/4 or less	Unk. time
D. Resid programs with 30-39 teachers							
1.	5	5	sT	sT	sT		sA,sT
2.	5	3		sA	sAT		sA
3.	3	3	s,sA,sA				
4.	3	3	s		sA,sT		
5.	3	2	s,sA				
6.	3	NR					
7.	2	2	s		sA		
8.	2	2	sA		sA		
9.	2	1	sA				
10.	2	1	sA				
11.	2	NR					
12.	2	NR					
13.	1	1			sA		
E. Resid programs with 40-49 teachers							
1.	6	5	s,s,s,sA,sA				
2.	4	3	sT	sA	sAT		
3.	4	3	s,s,	s			
4.	3	3	sAT,sAT,sAT				
5.	3	2	s			sA	
6.	3	2	sA		sA		
7.	3	1	sA				
8.	2	2	s,sA				
9.	2	1		sA			
F. Resid programs with 50-59 teachers							
1.	6	4	s,s,sA,sA				
2.	5	5	s,sA,sAT		s		
3.	4	4	sA,sA,sA		sA		
4.	3	2	s,sA				
G. Resid programs with 60-69 teachers							
1.	5	3	s,s,sA				
2.	4	4	sA,sA	sA	sA		
3.	4	NR					
4.	3	NR					
5.	2	1	sA				
6.	NR						
H. Resid programs with 70-79 teachers							
1.	8	6	s,sA,sA,sA,sA	sA			
2.	7	6	s,s,s,s,s,sA				
3.	6	6	s,s,s,sA,sA,sA				
4.	6	5	s,sA,sA,sAT				s
5.	5	2	s		sAT		
6.	4	2	s,sA				
7.	4	2	sA	s			
I. Resid programs with 80-80 teachers							
1.	8	6	s,s,sA,sA	sA	sA		
2.	6	3	s,s,	s			
3.	4	2					sA,sA
4.	4	1	s				
J. Resid programs with 90 or more teachers							
1.	8	6	s,s,sA	sA	sA	sA	
2.	4	3	s,s,sA				
3.	4	1			sAT		

APPENDIX C

Tables for Chapter VII
"Graduate Programs for Supervisors"

Table C1. Supervisors' ratings of various types of graduate programs for preparing supervisors

Note. 4: Very important 3: Important 2: Less important 1: Not important
0: Undecided, no opinion; other response; no response

		Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
Type of Program	Rating	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
		Day respondents							
Doctoral program	4	7	28	6	10	3	13	16	15
	3	3	12	10	17	4	17	17	16
	2	4	16	21	35	4	17	29	27
	1	4	16	15	25	4	17	23	21
	0	7	28	8	13	8	35	23	21
One year of work beyond master's	4	13	52	28	47	5	22	46	43
	3	6	24	16	27	8	35	30	28
	2	1	4	4	7	2	9	7	7
	1	2	8	4	7	0	0	6	6
	0	3	12	8	13	8	35	19	18
Master's degree	4	14	56	25	42	9	39	48	44
	3	4	16	16	27	8	35	28	26
	2	3	12	5	8	3	13	11	10
	1	1	4	3	5	0	0	4	4
	0	3	12	11	18	3	13	17	16
One year program (with 1 or 2 summer sessions)	4	4	16	11	18	0	0	15	14
	3	3	12	18	30	7	30	28	26
	2	5	20	12	20	5	22	22	20
	1	1	4	3	5	2	9	6	6
	0	12	48	16	27	9	39	37	34
A series of summer sessions and workshops	4	3	12	11	18	3	13	17	16
	3	3	12	10	17	3	13	16	15
	2	4	16	16	27	6	26	26	24
	1	2	8	9	15	2	9	13	12
	0	13	52	14	23	9	39	36	33
Other types of programs		2	8	2	3	0	0	4	4
	NR	23	92	58	97	23	100	104	96
Totals*		25		60		23		108	
		Residential respondents							
Doctoral program	4	3	6	7	9	2	8	12	8
	3	7	15	15	19	2	8	24	16
	2	12	25	17	22	10	40	39	26
	1	16	33	20	26	3	12	39	26
	0	10	21	18	23	8	32	36	24
One year of work	4	11	23	28	36	6	24	45	30
	3	16	33	18	23	8	32	42	28
	2	6	13	11	14	6	24	23	15
	1	6	13	6	8	1	4	13	9
	0	9	19	14	18	4	16	27	18
Master's degree	4	21	44	35	45	9	36	65	43
	3	14	29	21	27	8	32	43	29
	2	4	8	4	5	4	16	12	8
	1	2	4	1	1	0	0	3	2
	0	7	15	16	21	4	16	27	18
One year program (with 1 or 2 summer sessions)	4	16	33	11	14	3	12	30	20
	3	10	21	24	31	10	40	44	29
	2	8	17	16	21	6	24	30	20
	1	4	8	5	6	2	8	11	7
	0	10	21	21	27	4	16	35	23
A series of summer sessions and workshops	4	7	15	11	14	7	28	25	17
	3	9	19	27	35	11	44	47	31
	2	12	25	15	19	2	8	29	19
	1	5	10	6	8	0	0	11	7
	0	15	31	18	23	5	20	38	25
Other types of programs		0	0	1	1	2	8	3	2
	NR	48	100	76	99	23	92	147	98
Totals*		48		77		25		150	

*There is more than one response per respondent. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Table C2. Day supervisors' ratings of graduate courses for experienced teachers of the deaf preparing to become supervisors

Note. 4: Very important 3: Important 2: Less important 1; Not important 0: Undecided, no opinion; other response, no response

	Group S		Group SA		Gr. S(A)T		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Psych. and ed. of the mentally ret.								
4	3	12	11	18	1	4	15	14
3	5	20	16	27	6	26	27	25
2	8	32	20	33	10	44	38	35
1	3	12	3	5	2	9	8	7
0	6	24	10	17	4	17	20	19
2) Guidance and counseling								
4	9	36	25	42	12	52	46	43
3	10	40	18	30	7	30	35	32
2	3	12	11	12	1	4	15	14
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	3	12	6	10	3	13	12	11
3) Recent research in special ed.								
4	9	36	21	35	12	52	42	39
3	10	40	23	38	4	17	37	34
2	4	16	9	15	3	13	16	15
1	0	0	2	3	1	4	3	3
0	2	8	5	8	3	13	10	9
4) Psych. and ed. of the gifted								
4	0	0	3	5	0	0	3	3
3	3	12	7	12	3	13	13	12
2	10	40	27	45	11	48	48	44
1	7	28	12	20	4	17	23	21
0	5	20	11	18	5	22	21	19
5) Clinical audiometry								
4	5	20	11	18	5	22	21	19
3	9	36	24	40	7	30	40	37
2	5	20	13	22	6	26	24	22
1	3	12	3	5	2	9	8	7
0	3	12	9	15	3	13	15	14
6) Curriculum theory and development								
4	17	68	34	57	15	65	66	61
3	5	20	13	22	4	17	22	20
2	1	4	8	13	1	4	10	9
1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
0	2	8	4	7	3	13	9	8
7) Supervision								
4	17	68	37	62	14	61	68	63
3	5	20	12	20	5	22	22	20
2	0	0	8	13	1	4	9	8
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	3	12	3	5	3	13	9	8
8) Learning Dis.: diag. and remed.								
4	12	48	35	58	13	57	60	56
3	11	44	18	30	6	26	35	32
2	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	2
1	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	1
0	2	8	5	8	3	13	10	9
9) Administration								
4	6	24	16	27	5	22	27	25
3	8	32	21	35	7	30	36	33
2	6	24	15	25	8	35	29	27
1	1	4	4	7	1	4	6	6
0	4	16	4	7	2	9	10	9
10) Linguistics; psycholinguistics								
4	9	36	17	28	5	22	31	29
3	7	28	21	35	6	26	34	32
2	7	28	14	23	7	30	28	26
1	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	1
0	2	8	8	13	4	17	14	13
11) Child development; child psych.								
4	12	48	35	58	13	57	60	56
3	9	36	19	32	5	22	33	31
2	2	8	1	2	2	9	5	5
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	8	5	8	3	13	10	9
12) Speech and hearing science								
4	9	36	38	63	11	48	58	54
3	7	28	12	20	7	30	26	24
2	6	24	4	7	2	9	12	11
1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
0	3	12	5	8	3	13	11	10
13) Research techniques and statistics								
4	5	20	7	12	2	9	14	13
3	4	16	18	30	2	9	24	22
2	10	40	26	43	11	48	47	44
1	3	12	4	7	4	17	11	10
0	3	12	5	8	4	17	12	11
14) Reading								
4	11	44	34	57	10	44	55	51
3	5	20	14	23	7	30	26	24
2	7	28	7	12	2	9	16	15
1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
0	2	8	4	7	4	14	10	9
15) Ed. of disturbed, conduct-prob. child.								
4	5	20	15	25	6	26	26	24
3	11	44	31	52	6	26	48	44
2	2	8	8	13	7	30	17	16
1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
0	7	28	5	8	4	17	16	15
16) Ed. and psych. measurement								
4	4	16	9	15	3	13	16	15
3	10	40	29	48	12	52	51	47
2	7	28	16	27	5	22	28	26
1	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	2
0	4	16	5	8	2	9	11	10
17) Psycho-social prob. of except.child.								
4	4	16	19	32	9	39	32	30
3	13	52	25	42	6	26	44	41
2	5	20	10	17	4	17	19	18
1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
0	3	12	5	8	4	17	12	11
18) Other courses listed								
	4	16	9	15	3	13	16	15
NR	21	84	51	85	20	87	92	85
Totals*	25		60		23		108	

*Every Day respondent is represented in each of the 18 categories. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Table C3. Residential supervisors' ratings of graduate courses for experienced teachers of the deaf preparing to become supervisors

Note. 4: Very important 3: Important 2: Less important 1: Not important 0: Undecided, no opinion; other response; no response

	Group S		Group SA		Gr. S(A)T		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Psych. and ed. of the mentally ret.								
4	11	23	9	12	5	20	25	17
3	24	50	42	55	11	44	77	51
2	6	13	15	19	6	24	27	18
1	1	2	8	10	0	0	9	6
0	6	13	3	4	3	12	12	8
2) Guidance and counseling								
4	21	44	37	48	10	40	68	45
3	16	33	25	32	11	44	52	35
2	7	15	9	12	2	8	18	12
1	0	0	3	4	0	0	3	2
0	4	8	3	4	2	8	9	6
3) Recent research in special ed.								
4	17	35	23	30	10	40	50	33
3	17	35	31	40	9	36	57	38
2	8	17	16	21	3	12	27	18
1	1	2	3	4	0	0	4	3
0	5	10	4	5	3	12	12	8
4) Psych. and ed. of the gifted								
4	2	4	1	1	2	8	5	3
3	10	21	20	26	3	12	33	22
2	25	52	32	42	14	56	71	47
1	5	10	18	23	3	12	26	17
0	6	13	6	8	3	13	15	10
5) Clinical audiometry								
4	2	4	5	6	3	12	10	7
3	14	29	30	39	9	36	53	35
2	21	44	24	31	7	28	52	35
1	4	8	14	18	3	12	21	14
0	7	15	4	5	3	12	14	9
6) Curriculum theory and development								
4	23	48	42	55	16	64	81	54
3	21	44	28	36	6	24	55	37
2	1	2	3	4	1	4	5	3
1	1	2	2	3	0	0	3	2
0	2	4	2	3	2	8	6	4
7) Supervision								
4	32	67	55	71	16	64	103	69
3	11	23	19	25	7	28	37	25
2	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
1	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	1
0	4	8	1	1	2	8	7	5
8) Learning Dis.: diag. and remed.								
4	23	48	37	48	11	44	71	47
3	19	40	33	43	11	44	63	42
2	3	6	5	7	0	0	8	5
1	0	0	1	1	1	4	2	1
0	3	6	1	1	2	8	6	4
9) Administration								
4	11	23	25	32	8	32	44	29
3	13	27	36	47	9	36	58	39
2	14	29	10	13	6	24	30	20
1	3	6	3	4	0	0	6	4
0	7	15	3	4	2	8	12	8
10) Linguistics; psycholinguistics								
4	12	25	15	19	6	24	33	22
3	11	23	23	30	8	32	42	28
2	9	19	27	35	6	24	42	28
1	5	10	8	10	0	0	13	9
0	11	23	4	5	5	20	20	13
11) Child development; child psych.								
4	26	54	41	53	12	48	79	53
3	13	27	29	38	9	36	51	34
2	4	8	5	6	1	4	10	7
1	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	1
0	4	8	1	1	3	12	8	5
12) Speech and hearing science								
4	17	35	19	25	10	40	46	31
3	19	40	33	43	9	36	61	41
2	6	13	11	14	3	12	20	13
1	1	2	7	9	0	0	8	5
0	5	10	7	9	3	12	15	10
13) Research techniques and statistics								
4	2	4	1	1	2	8	5	3
3	8	17	33	43	8	32	49	33
2	26	54	31	40	10	40	67	45
1	4	8	5	6	3	12	12	8
0	8	17	7	9	2	8	17	11
14) Reading								
4	34	71	48	62	13	52	95	63
3	9	19	19	25	9	36	37	25
2	2	4	8	10	1	4	11	7
1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
0	3	6	1	1	2	8	6	4
15) Ed. of disturbed, conduct-prob.child.								
4	16	33	12	16	9	36	37	25
3	24	50	43	56	10	40	77	51
2	5	10	16	21	3	12	24	16
1	0	0	1	1	1	4	2	1
0	3	6	5	6	2	8	10	7
16) Ed. and psych. measurement								
4	9	19	14	18	5	20	28	19
3	23	48	40	52	15	60	78	52
2	13	27	17	22	3	12	33	22
1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
0	3	6	5	6	2	8	10	7
17) Psycho-social prob. of except. child.								
4	11	23	10	13	5	20	26	17
3	18	38	44	57	12	48	74	49
2	13	27	17	22	4	16	34	23
1	1	2	2	3	1	4	4	3
0	5	10	4	5	3	12	12	8
18 Other courses listed								
	7	15	12	16	2	8	21	14
NR	41	85	65	84	23	92	129	86
Totals*								
	48		77		25		150	

*Every Residential respondent is represented in each of the 18 categories. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Table C4. Supervisors' ratings of various experiences for teachers of the deaf preparing to become supervisors

Note 4: Very important 3: Important 2: Less important 1: Not important
0: Undecided, no opinion; other response; no response

Experience	Rating	Group S No.	Group S %	Group SA No.	Group SA %	Group S(A)T No.	Group S(A)T %	Total No.	Total %
		Day respondents							
Planned observations by a wide variety of programs for the deaf	4	17	68	41	68	12	52	70	64
	3	5	20	15	25	8	35	28	26
	2	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	2
	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
	0	3	12	2	3	2	9	7	7
Internship with successful, established supervisors of the deaf	4	10	40	33	55	13	57	56	52
	3	10	40	21	35	8	35	39	36
	2	1	4	4	7	0	0	5	5
	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	1
	0	3	12	2	3	2	9	7	7
Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors	4	4	16	17	28	4	17	25	23
	3	14	56	32	53	12	52	58	54
	2	2	8	9	15	5	22	16	15
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	5	20	2	3	2	9	9	8
Experience in interpreting psych., ed. and medical reports and records	4	12	48	26	43	9	39	47	44
	3	8	32	24	40	6	26	38	35
	2	2	8	6	10	5	22	13	12
	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	2
	0	3	12	3	5	2	9	8	7
Other experiences		3	12	7	12	4	17	14	13
	NR	22	88	53	88	19	83	94	87
Totals*		25		60		23		108	
		Residential respondents							
Planned observations by a wide variety of programs for the deaf	4	23	48	51	66	17	68	91	61
	3	20	42	19	25	4	16	43	29
	2	3	6	6	8	1	4	10	7
	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	2	1
	0	2	4	0	0	2	8	4	3
Internship with successful, established supervisors of the deaf	4	30	63	39	51	13	52	82	55
	3	13	27	28	36	5	20	46	31
	2	3	6	7	9	4	16	14	9
	1	0	0	2	3	1	4	3	2
	0	2	4	1	1	2	8	5	3
Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors	4	16	33	31	40	10	40	57	38
	3	19	40	37	48	11	44	67	45
	2	9	19	7	9	2	8	18	12
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	4	8	2	3	2	8	8	5
Experience in interpreting psych., ed. and medical reports and	4	10	21	19	25	8	32	37	25
	3	18	38	41	53	8	32	67	45
	2	16	33	15	19	6	24	37	25
	1	1	2	0	0	1	4	2	1
	0	3	6	2	3	2	8	7	5
Other experiences		3	6	6	8	4	16	13	9
	NR	45	94	71	92	21	84	137	91
Totals*		48		77		25		150	

*There is more than one response per respondent. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

Table C5. Day supervisors' ratings of graduate courses for their own advanced study

Note. 4: Very important 3: Important 2: Less important 1: Not important 0: Undecided, no opinion; other response; no response

	Group S N	Group S %	Group SA N	Group SA %	Gr. S(A)T N	Gr. S(A)T %	Total N	Total %
1) Psych. and ed. of mentally ret.								
4	4	16	14	23	2	9	20	19
3	3	12	6	10	5	22	14	13
2	5	20	20	33	6	26	31	29
1	5	20	5	8	5	22	15	14
0	8	32	15	25	5	22	28	26
2) Guidance and counseling								
4	6	24	23	38	11	48	40	37
3	11	44	13	22	6	26	30	28
2	2	8	7	12	0	0	9	8
1	2	8	4	7	2	9	8	7
0	4	16	13	22	4	17	21	19
3) Recent research in special ed.								
4	11	44	27	45	12	52	50	46
3	8	32	14	23	4	17	26	24
2	4	16	7	12	2	9	13	12
1	0	0	2	3	1	4	3	3
0	2	8	10	17	4	17	16	15
4) Psych. and ed. of the gifted								
4	2	8	2	3	0	0	4	4
3	2	8	10	17	2	9	14	13
2	7	28	21	35	9	39	37	34
1	5	20	12	20	8	35	25	23
0	9	36	15	25	4	17	28	26
5) Clinical audiometry								
4	4	16	13	22	4	17	21	19
3	6	24	18	30	6	26	30	28
2	4	16	13	22	5	22	22	20
1	6	24	5	8	4	17	15	14
0	5	20	11	18	4	17	20	19
6) Curriculum theory and development								
4	14	56	28	47	10	44	52	48
3	5	20	10	17	6	26	21	19
2	2	8	8	13	2	9	12	11
1	1	4	2	3	1	4	4	4
0	3	12	12	20	4	17	19	18
7) Supervision								
4	7	28	27	45	14	61	48	44
3	7	28	10	17	4	17	21	19
2	3	12	8	13	0	0	11	10
1	4	20	5	8	1	4	10	9
0	4	16	10	17	4	17	18	17
8) Learning Dis.: diag. and remed.								
4	13	52	29	48	13	57	55	51
3	7	28	20	33	3	13	30	28
2	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	2
1	2	8	1	2	2	9	5	5
0	3	12	9	15	4	17	16	15
9) Administration								
4	2	8	17	28	5	22	24	22
3	8	32	12	20	7	30	27	25
2	4	16	12	20	5	22	21	19
1	4	16	9	15	1	4	14	13
0	7	28	10	17	5	22	22	20
10) Linguistics; psycholinguistics								
4	9	36	18	30	4	17	31	29
3	4	16	16	27	7	30	27	25
2	5	20	13	22	5	22	23	21
1	0	0	0	0	3	13	3	3
0	7	28	13	22	4	17	24	22
11) Child development; child psych.								
4	7	28	23	38	7	30	37	34
3	7	28	13	22	4	17	24	22
2	4	16	8	13	6	26	18	17
1	2	8	4	7	2	9	8	7
0	5	20	12	20	4	17	21	19
12) Speech and hearing science								
4	6	24	25	42	5	22	36	33
3	5	20	13	22	7	30	25	23
2	3	12	10	17	3	13	16	15
1	6	24	1	2	3	13	10	9
0	5	20	11	18	5	22	21	19
13) Research techniques and statistics								
4	3	12	6	10	1	4	10	9
3	7	28	15	25	5	22	27	25
2	4	16	21	35	9	39	34	32
1	5	20	6	10	4	17	15	14
0	6	24	12	20	4	17	22	20
14) Reading								
4	10	40	19	32	7	30	36	33
3	3	12	16	27	6	26	25	23
2	5	20	9	15	4	17	18	17
1	2	8	4	7	1	4	7	7
0	5	20	12	20	5	22	22	20
15) Ed. of disturbed, conduct-prob.child.								
4	8	32	17	28	4	17	29	27
3	6	24	24	40	6	26	36	33
2	3	12	7	12	6	26	16	15
1	1	4	1	2	1	4	3	3
0	7	28	11	18	6	26	24	22
16) Ed. and psych. measurement								
4	2	8	9	15	3	13	14	13
3	4	16	22	37	8	35	34	32
2	8	32	13	22	5	22	26	24
1	4	16	6	10	2	9	12	11
0	7	28	10	17	5	22	22	20
17) Psycho-social prob. of except.child.								
4	4	16	15	25	7	30	26	24
3	9	36	25	42	8	35	42	39
2	3	12	5	8	2	9	10	9
1	2	8	2	3	1	4	5	5
0	7	28	13	22	5	22	25	23
18) Other courses listed								
	5	20	6	10	3	13	14	13
NR	20	80	54	90	20	87	94	87
Totals*								
	25		60		23		108	

*Every Day respondent is represented in each of the 18 categories. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Table C6. Residential supervisors' ratings of graduate courses for their own advanced study

Note. 4: Very important 3: Important 2: Less important 1: Not important 0: Undecided, no opinion; other response; no response

	Group S		Group SA		Gr. S(A)T		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Psych. and ed. of the mentally ret.								
4	12	25	10	13	8	32	30	20
3	19	40	28	36	8	32	55	37
2	12	25	16	21	6	24	34	23
1	0	0	8	10	0	0	8	5
0	5	10	15	19	3	12	23	15
2) Guidance and counseling								
4	18	38	28	36	12	48	58	39
3	12	25	27	35	6	24	45	30
2	8	17	7	9	3	12	18	12
1	1	2	4	5	1	4	6	4
0	9	19	11	14	3	12	23	15
3) Recent research in special ed.								
4	14	29	30	39	11	44	55	37
3	21	44	24	31	10	40	55	37
2	4	8	10	13	2	8	16	11
1	2	4	4	5	0	0	6	4
0	7	15	9	12	2	8	18	12
4) Psych. and ed. of the gifted								
4	1	2	5	6	1	4	7	5
3	12	25	11	14	4	16	27	18
2	19	40	28	36	12	48	59	39
1	5	10	18	23	3	12	26	17
0	11	23	15	19	5	20	31	21
5) Clinical audiometry								
4	3	6	4	5	4	16	11	7
3	8	17	25	32	6	24	39	26
2	17	35	21	27	8	32	46	31
1	5	10	13	17	2	8	20	13
0	15	31	14	18	5	20	34	23
6) Curriculum theory and development								
4	23	48	38	49	17	68	78	52
3	14	29	20	26	6	24	40	27
2	4	8	3	4	0	0	7	5
1	0	0	3	4	0	0	3	2
0	7	15	13	17	2	8	22	15
7) Supervision								
4	29	60	40	52	15	60	84	56
3	7	15	19	25	6	24	32	21
2	1	2	6	8	1	4	8	5
1	2	4	2	3	0	0	4	3
0	9	19	10	13	3	12	22	15
8) Learning Dis.: diag. and remed.								
4	27	56	35	45	8	32	70	47
3	12	25	27	35	15	60	54	36
2	3	6	3	4	1	4	7	5
1	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	1
0	5	10	11	14	1	4	17	11
9) Administration								
4	10	21	26	34	9	36	45	30
3	10	21	27	35	4	16	41	27
2	8	17	10	13	10	40	28	19
1	6	13	3	4	0	0	9	6
0	14	29	11	14	2	8	27	18
10) Linguistics; psycholinguistics								
4	10	21	14	18	6	24	30	20
3	11	23	23	30	9	36	43	29
2	9	19	21	27	4	16	34	23
1	4	8	7	9	1	4	12	8
0	14	29	12	16	5	20	31	21
11) Child development; child psych.								
4	13	27	25	32	13	52	51	34
3	16	33	27	35	5	20	48	32
2	4	8	10	13	4	16	18	12
1	5	10	4	5	1	4	10	7
0	10	21	11	14	2	8	23	15
12) Speech and hearing science								
4	11	23	14	18	10	40	35	23
3	12	25	25	32	3	12	40	27
2	9	19	17	22	7	28	33	22
1	5	10	4	5	2	8	11	7
0	11	23	17	22	3	12	31	21
13) Research techniques and statistics								
4	2	4	12	16	2	8	16	11
3	9	19	32	42	9	36	50	33
2	19	40	15	19	9	36	43	29
1	6	13	4	5	3	12	13	9
0	12	24	14	18	2	8	28	19
14) Reading								
4	27	56	37	48	13	52	77	51
3	11	23	18	23	9	36	38	25
2	1	2	9	12	1	4	11	7
1	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	1
0	9	19	11	14	2	8	22	15
15) Ed. of disturbed, conduct-prob.child.								
4	23	48	21	27	8	32	52	35
3	16	33	29	38	12	48	57	38
2	4	8	13	17	2	8	19	13
1	0	0	2	3	1	4	3	2
0	5	10	12	16	2	8	19	13
16) Ed. and psych. measurement								
4	5	10	12	16	6	24	23	15
3	18	38	33	43	12	48	63	42
2	13	27	16	21	2	8	31	21
1	3	6	4	5	2	8	9	6
0	9	19	12	16	3	12	24	16
17) Psycho-social prob. of except. child.								
4	11	23	18	23	6	24	35	23
3	14	29	30	39	11	44	55	37
2	11	23	14	18	3	12	28	19
1	4	8	2	3	1	4	7	5
0	8	17	13	17	4	16	25	17
18) Other courses listed								
	3	6	4	5	1	4	8	5
NR	45	94	73	95	24	96	143	95
Totals*								
	48		77		25		150	

*Every Residential respondent is represented in each of the 18 categories. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Table C7. Supervisors' ratings of various experiences
for their own advanced study

Note. 4: Very important 3: Important 2: Less important 1: Not important
0: Undecided, no opinion; other response; no response

		Group S		Group SA		Group S(A)T		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Experience	Rating	Day respondents							
Planned observations by a wide variety of programs for the deaf	4	15	60	36	60	10	44	61	57
	3	5	20	14	23	9	39	28	26
	2	1	4	3	5	0	0	4	4
	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	2
	0	4	16	6	10	3	13	13	12
Internship with successful, established supervisors of the deaf	4	10	40	31	52	15	65	56	52
	3	8	32	11	18	4	17	23	21
	2	2	8	10	17	0	0	12	11
	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	1
	0	5	20	8	13	3	13	16	15
Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors	4	8	32	23	38	6	26	37	34
	3	9	36	23	38	13	57	45	42
	2	3	12	7	12	1	4	11	10
	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
	0	5	20	6	10	3	13	14	13
Experience in interpreting psych., ed. and medical reports and records	4	8	32	22	37	7	30	37	34
	3	7	28	19	32	7	30	33	31
	2	4	16	8	13	4	17	16	15
	1	1	4	4	7	2	9	7	7
	0	5	20	7	12	3	13	15	14
Other experiences		1	4	5	8	2	9	8	7
	NR	24	96	55	92	21	91	100	93
Totals*		25		60		23		108	
		Residential respondents							
Planned observations by a wide variety of programs for the deaf	4	29	60	47	61	15	60	91	61
	3	11	23	17	22	6	24	34	23
	2	3	6	4	5	1	4	8	5
	1	1	2	2	3	1	4	4	3
	0	4	8	7	9	2	8	13	9
Internship with successful, established supervisors of the deaf	4	28	58	43	56	14	56	85	57
	3	11	23	12	16	4	16	27	18
	2	3	6	13	17	3	12	19	13
	1	1	2	1	1	1	4	3	2
	0	5	10	8	10	3	12	16	11
Attendance at conferences and workshops for teacher supervisors	4	16	33	32	42	13	52	61	41
	3	18	38	30	39	9	36	57	38
	2	11	23	8	10	1	4	20	13
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	3	6	7	9	2	8	12	8
Experience in interpreting psych., ed. and medical reports and records	4	12	25	23	30	6	24	41	27
	3	19	40	29	38	10	40	58	39
	2	9	19	14	18	4	16	27	18
	1	1	1	3	4	1	4	5	3
	0	7	15	8	10	4	16	19	13
Other experiences		0	0	5	6	3	12	8	5
	NR	48	100	72	94	22	88	142	95
Totals*		48		77		25		150	

*There is more than one response per respondent. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.